BX
8605.1
.M82

BX 8601 .M675 v.1 1904
The Mormon point of view ;

BX 8601 .M675 v.1 1904
The Mormon point of view ;

RICKS COLLEGE
DAVID O. McKAY LRC
REXBURG [illegible]

THE MORMON POINT OF VIEW.

A Quarterly Magazine, owned and edited by N. L. Nelson, Professor of English, Brigham Young University. Price, $1.00 a year; single copies, 30 cents. Office, 445 N. 4 E., Provo City, Utah. Second-class postage applied for.

Vol. I. Provo City, Utah, Jan. 1, 1904. No. 1.

RICKS COLLEGE
DAVID O. McKAY LRC
REXBURG, IDAHO 83440

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/mormonpointofvie00nels

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

WHY THIS MAGAZINE IS NEEDED.

Looking upward from my study window toward the east, I see a magnificent range of mountains,—rugged and precipitous in their lower reaches, covered midway with a sombre belt of pines, lastly capped in the dazzling whiteness of eternal snows. On the south I look out upon a splendid valley, lately a sunburnt-desert echoing to the metalic screech of the cricket; now variegated with garden, meadow, field, and orchard, and broken here and there by a succession of rural towns. The connection between what I see respectively from the two windows of my study,—between the snow-drifts on the mountain tops and the smiling valley below,—is too obvious to need pointing out.

tion, a hereafter of our dreams. There is no heaven other than the Here and Now,—no hell more dreadful than that which overtakes the sinner every day,—if he could but realize the deadening effect, the soul-paralysis, of his evil deeds.

That there will be a future Heaven, both as to mental state and also as to locality,—a time and place in which the Here and Now shall have advanced ineffably in glory—who can doubt that observes the trend of human life? That there will also be a future Hell—the sum-total both as to place and mental state, of the daily accumulations of discord in the soul,—accompanied perhaps by a keen awakening,—is also past question to any believer in the persistency of life after death, who notes the progressive downward tendency of the unrepentant sinner. These future epochs in the soul may readily be conceded.

The point to bear in mind, however, is this: that future states, being progressively the outcome of present states, do not differ from their precursors in kind but only in degree; and consequently, that any Here and Now is heaven or hell to us at a given time, in precisely the same sense that the future will be, when it in turn becomes our

But in a more spiritual sense, let us live this miracle of transformation over again. Let those dazzling banks of congealed health and wealth,—pure, beautiful, enhaloed by heaven's own blue, but withal cold and distant,—stand for the religious ideals of mankind. Next let the valley again be conceived as barren and unfruitful; let its teeming and throbbing evidences of life, its marvelous commingling of form, color, sound, and motion, be counted for what they are—the world of Mammon in which we live, and breathe, and have our being; overlook all these things, and still see vast stretches of soul-barrenness among mankind.

Then the purpose of this magazine is to help melt those snows—those lofty idealizations of theology and philosophy—and cause them to flow downward to the thirsty valley of spiritual life; help dig the canals and laterals to the sun-baked regions of the human heart; help direct the emancipated streams of God's truth upon the social, moral, and spiritual deserts in a world given up to greed and self-seeking.

Religion must be socialized; it has too long been cultivated for the sake of a hypothetical Heaven—a paradise of the imagina-

Here and Now. Furthermore, as we shall be able to realize those future states only as time thus brings us into them, it follows that the only Heaven man need strive for, the only Hell he need fear, is the Heaven or the Hell of daily living.

It is the failure to keep this elementary fact in mind that has led to most of the shams and artificialities in religion. Men walk through this life with their eyes glued upon a paradise in the clouds, and so miss the only paradise the universe has to offer them, the paradise of the natural (which is also the spiritual) world around them; their imaginations being filled with a mystic "beatific vision" remote in time and space, they fail to find and commune with God and Christ daily, from the rising to the setting of the sun; dreaming as they do of a heaven "beyond the bounds of time and space," they become callous to their responsibilities in the social world, the world of men and brave deeds—the only heaven man is yet fitted to know. It is thus that men are blinded to the majesty and glory of God's creations here below; neither enjoying the bliss to be felt in this present heaven, nor helping to increase that bliss for themselves —in the only way it can be done—by trying

to increase the bliss of the Here and Now for others.

Let the mind travel for a moment over the make-believes that have been contrived through the ages to blind man to his only heaven, the Here and Now—and make him shirk his duties in it. First, the notion that bliss is an ethereal something located in a still more etherial somewhere; second, that to attain it, "man can do nothing for himself,—the blessed Savior must do it all;" third, the consequent degeneration of the virile worship of "doing," into a maudlin worship of merely singing and praying; fourth, the mechanical conception that salvation, instead of being an organic—that is to say—a living, growing state of the soul, is an external relation,—a coming-out-of-some-place or going-into-some-place state of the soul,—that can be affected by the prayers and importunings of other men, by the absolution of priests, or by the performing of pilgrimages, the building of churches, and things of like nature; sixth, the consequent thousand-fold variety of pitiful subterfuges designed to bribe Peter and cheat Lucifer,—pitiful because of their bare-faced transparency; the result of it all being, that the really vital relations affecting the destiny of mankind,—the relations which ministers of the Gospel call secular affairs—are left, in the language of these same called and chosen (!) to the "devil;" that is to say, in the hands of men and women who have not "got religion."

Latter-day Saints, realizing as they do that salvation is a progressive coming into harmony with law; that heaven, the expression of that harmony, is a state of the soul, which inevitably causes gravitation towards a place; that both state and place are now, and ever will be, on this earth;—realizing, I repeat, these fundamental truths, their religion finds no place for the pious artificialities above enumerated.

That is to say, in theory. In practice they are far from being free from them. Although it is preached every Sunday that the Gospel involves the sum-total of man's activities, secular or otherwise,—no one principle of truth being holier than another,—yet they go on looking skyward toward a hypothetical heaven, to the shameful neglect of the Here and Now; all the time knowing, but not realizing, that the Heaven to come can be entered only by him who has seen and felt and LIVED the heaven that is here.

What is the matter? They are still in

Babylon. They are still struggling with the tide of heredity. Their heads are above water, truly enough—which is to say, they see the better way; but their bodies are swept onward by the almost resistless current of tradition and convention. Or, to return to my first figure, their ideals, like snow-banks, lie unmelted high in the blue heavens of theory. When confronted by some desperate condition of society, they will all say, (and say truly): "That will never be settled until it is settled according to the Gospel." But when asked to point out the definite remedy for it in the Gospel, they return a vague answer. They see the snow on the mountain top, and they know its life-giving virtues; but how to make it reach the arid social spot, they are quite content to leave solely to the Lord; the while they go on living a "respectable" life; that is to say, the narrow, self-seeking life which custom and convention have saddled upon them.

Let me not be too severe, however; Latter-day Saints have done something toward cutting loose from Babylon,—so much, indeed, that the "doing" side of their religion is made the occasion at present of widespread ministerial alarm. In colonizing,

for instance, they have carried out the policy of small farms, with every family in possession of a home. In domestic life, they have come to regard adultery as a crime second only to murder, and made the standard of chastity equal for both sexes. So, too, they believe in the natural right of every worthy woman, as well as of every worthy man, to honorable posterity; but are restrained, by choice of the lesser of two evils, from longer acting out the ideal. Some ideals—such as co-operation and the United Order—have been tried and found practically beyond them: they are not far enough emancipated from Babylon as yet. Other ideals are looming up before them, as the dawn of progress brightens into day; but after all is said, it is extremely difficult for them to change the inertia which holds them in the ruts of conventionality—next to impossible to leaven completely the dough of their worldliness. Practice drags woefully behind theory.

Naturally enough,—and would it were truer than it is!—whenever the opportunity of "doing" presents a choice, as in politics, every Mormon acts in a way to conserve and promote his own ideals, rather than the ideals of his opponents. Nor is there

the slightest occasion—how could there be?—for him to receive "dictation" from ecclesiastical superiors. To expect him to act differently is to suppose him devoid of common horse sense. Herein lies the only coloring of truth in the oft-repeated charge of union between church and state. As the Mormon's religion involves the sum-total of his aspirations and activities, it follows that politics, and all the functions of government to which it leads, must appeal to the same standard of conscience as any other truth or duty in life. How could Mormons do otherwise than act together?

It is this all-inclusive notion of religion that ministers of the Gospel should attack; instead of stooping to lend a false aspect to some detail in the expression of it. "Why can't you people be like the rest of us?" said Grover Cleveland. Here was an invitation to come down to the world's dead level of conventionality; accepting such ideals of life as respectability (!) sanctions, and for religion a set of innocuous beliefs, the acting out of which is reserved for a hypothetical future world! Mr. Cleveland could have promised peace as a reward for such a surrender, also the good fellowship of all "Christians," and finally—oblivion.

"If ye were of the world, the world would love its own." But may the day never come when Mormons shall value that love higher than their ideals; for the "love of the world is death."

No. Mormonism cannot compromise with any religion on earth, nor with any other system at variance with its principles; for Mormonism does not bring into the world the peace of a pusillanimous surrender; it brings the sword of God's own truth. Let the apologist, the time-server, and the coward, take warning, therefore, and desert to the other side. There is no place in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints for the half-hearted or the white-livered.

Our warfare is against error and injustice wheresoever, whensoever, and howsoever intrenched. Nor can wrongs escape us by being dubbed social, educational, scientific, secular, political, economic, or otherwise; for truth recognizes no such artificial distinctions. Ministers of sectarian churches may continue to narrow their work to what they call evangelizing,—Mormonism can contemplate nothing short of the social regeneration of the world.

And this brings me to my point; which

is, that we have need to change, or rather enlarge, the range of our methods. Hitherto it has sufficed to present the truth from its purely scriptural aspect. As a result, we have succeeded in gathering just that class of people—simple, honest, guileless, spiritual-minded Nathanaels—whom it was desirable to have as foundation stones for this new order of society. But there are others no less worthy: hard-headed thinkers, trained in the exact methods of modern schools; doubting Thomases of art, science, mechanics, and business, who value unsupported authority as nothing, even though it be Biblical; without whom, nevertheless, no scheme of social reform can pass very far beyond the speculative stage. Indeed, considering the constantly diminishing returns of our missionary work, it is pretty evident that the world has, during the last half century, veered almost completely around from the Nathanael to the Thomas type of mind. Scriptural propaganda is no longer effective.

Now, there is no arguing against facts. These men must be appealed to as they can be, not as they can't. If the ideals of Mormonism can be presented in the terms of natural science and philosophy; if the prin-

ciples underlying our religion can be identified with the facts involved in economic, educational, and sociological processes, then they will listen; for just now the relations of man to his fellow man is the one absorbing theme of humanity.

Besides, this unfolding of the Gospel far down into its social, educational, and economic bearings, is needed more urgently among the Latter-day Saints themselves, than among the world. Progress in any direction implies a previous knowledge of the way. We are all convinced that this despised social nucleus called Mormonism, is destined to evolve harmoniously into the Millennium. Now, it can't be dreamed there, nor prayed there; it can come only as the result of a gradual social evolution,—a gradual shaping and moulding of the individual into harmony with definite principles of truth. God cannot bring it about, independently of man; any more than He can save man without man's co-operation.

Surely, then, among a people holding ideals perfect as ours, and yet making widespread ship-wreck of the simplest social experiments,—I refer to co-operative stores,—there is need of thinking principles down to the details of their expression in life:

need of melting the abstractions of theory lying cold on the mountains of speculation, and releasing their truths that may flow down and invigorate the social, moral, and spiritual deserts of the Here and Now.

It is not knowledge, however, that Latter-day Saints need so much to give to the world. On the contrary, we need to borrow in most directions, rather than to give; for in this particular, Daniel's prophecy has been literally fulfilled: "Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." But in spite of the increase, the running to and fro continues. It is in this particular, then, that Mormonism can best help the world: it can contribute a point of view that shall unify and marshal into one grand, eternal perspective, all the fragmentary truths which now serve mainly to distract mankind. For this work—for the redistribution of the world's knowledge according to the Mormon point of view,—ten thousand abler pens than mine are needed. Let me not shrink, however, from making a humble beginning.

What this point of view is, should naturally have formed the leading article of the opening number. For various reasons, however, I have reserved it for the second.

One of these reasons lies in the fact that I have another article more germane to the present religious agitation; viz., "The Ministers and the Mormons," a ten-thousand word thesis on the relative fitness to survive of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and the sects that are just now howling against Mormonism. Other articles are summed up in the general title: "The Dictionary of Slander," which will be continued in future numbers.

In conclusion, let me beg the reader's indulgence for a frank, personal statement. The Lord has blessed me, I believe, with things to say, and will bless, so long as I shall remember what and who I am. Yet my present work throws me into direct contact—so far as the views above outlined are concerned—with fewer than one hundred young people each year. I desire to increase this class to ten thousand. In short, I would bring the Brigham Young University, so far as my "philosophy of the Gospel" work is concerned, into the home of every Latter-day Saint. The difficulty confronting me is self-evident. To quote the brethren of the First Presidency:

"We feel very much gratified by the spirit of your letter, and pleased with the article setting forth the reasons why the magazine, which you propose to publish, is needed. As far as we are concerned, we should very much like to see a magazine published such as you have outlined; it would undoubtedly be a credit both to you as its publisher and to our community. But will it pay financially, and can it be done without financial injury to yourself and family? - - - - To be frank with you, we are afraid it will not pay. - - - -"

It has required a very high estimate of the ideas I desire to set forth to induce me to venture forward in view of such wise caution as this. Nor can I hope to compensate the subscriber by mere quantity, as compared with magazines in general. The merit of this journal—if merit it shall prove to have—must be in quality; and in suggesting this, I beg the reader not to think I am throwing a bouquet at myself, but rather that I am paying a tribute to the grandeur of our religion as it unfolds along advanced lines.

As for the outcome, I am fully aware that no moral bolstering ever yet succeeded in keeping alive that which intrinsically deserved to die, and consequently that my journalistic venture must, in the end, survive or perish by that merciless, but still on the whole very beneficent, law—the survival of the fittest. In the meanwhile, it may not

be out of place to suggest that the time to water a plant that you would really like to see grow, is while it is struggling for roots, not after it has failed to demonstrate its power to live without your aid.

LEADING ARTICLE.

THE MINISTERS AND THE MORMONS.

MINISTERIAL TONGUE VALOR AND ITS RESULTS.

"It [the Mormon Church] is not to be educated, not to be civilized, not to be reformed—it must be crushed. No other organization is so perfect as the Mormon Church, except the German army."—Rev. Charles Thompson, D. D., of New York, before the Presbyterian general assembly at Los Angeles, May 26, 1903.

During the last three quarters of a century, remarks like the above have formed the staple commentary on Mormonism; and the animus so expressed, bolstered indeed by whatever facts could be impressed into such service, has found its way into dictionary, cyclopedia, and general history. It need not be pointed out here that these harsh judgments have almost invariably originated with those guardians of our moral and spiritual civilization, the ministers of the Gospel; nor need it be wondered at, therefore, that the Mormons credit the unbalanced zeal of the preaching fraternity with being a prime cause of all the mobbings and drivings which have marked

them out as the persecuted religion of the nineteenth century.

To the extent that we Mormons are Latter-day Saints, we smile at and forget ministerial zeal like that quoted above; for our religion teaches us to "do good to them that hate and revile us, and to pray for them that despitefully use us, and speak all manner of evil against us."

But to the extent that we are merely Mormons, that is to say, human beings trammeled by church forms, we keep tab of such utterances—and the deeds which often follow them; whence it happens that by every human law of offense and reprisal, the sins of the clerical profession against the Mormons, should have accumulated by now past all hope of their ever establishing among us those bonds of fraternal sympathy which are indispensable to proselyting work among any people.

As mere human beings, we cannot forget that it is their prejudiced views and mistaken zeal that have propagated the hundreds of lurid "Mormonisms Exposed," which have come to be as necessary as narcotics to many good people. Naturally enough, too, we resent the air of superior sanctity with which these same men condemn our

religion unheard. And if our confidence in them is shattered by the way in which they show us up,—from mere fragmentary and often misquoted passages; and if our respect follows our confidence, when we see the obvious connection between our periodical besmirchment by them, through the eastern press and pulpit, and their evident need of funds for the "Mormon crusade," is it not precisely what would happen with any other people under like provocation?

Now, if this animus of meddling clergymen stopped with the godly men themselves, one might regard it as a necessary evil,—a sort of escape-valve for the lingering spirit of Adam in them; but it spreads,—much faster than righteousness could,—as any message winged by hate always will; so that more than once in the history of Mormonism a whole continent has been inflamed against an unoffending people behind the Rocky mountains.

One can readily imagine the mental process by which the opinion of the pastor becomes the conviction of the congregation. Accustomed—not without good reasons—to consider his judgment as the standard of righteousness, the flock can only conclude that what excites godly anger in the shep-

herd must be bad indeed; and on no other form of sin does the good man usually wax so righteously eloquent as on what he is pleased to call the delusion of Mormonism.

And yet on the other hand, one cannot help wondering that, in an age of psychic analysis, several palpable phases of this wholesale denunciation are overlooked by the laity in coming to a conclusion. First, the spectacle of a reverend gentleman turning red in the face and breaking out into anathemas against other interpreters of the religion of Jesus Christ, ought in itself to excite a cautious wonder; secondly, the fact that hatred (of Mormons) can temporarily unite sects which love (of Christ) has never hitherto brought together, ought at least to raise a doubt as to the real source of the inspiration; thirdly, the fact that Mormonism thrives in spite of this combined assault of other religions, ought to suggest that righteousness may possibly form a considerable part in the system which this ministerial anger denounces; since by the growing wisdom of the age, sin is coming to be regarded as weak, transitory, wholly incapable of cohesion,—righteousness alone being vigorous enough to form and perpetuate an organic system.

All this negative agitation by ministers of the gospel could be overlooked, however, as what we ourselves might do under similar circumstances; but it will not down even with the best of us, that in all the drivings, mobbings, and sanguinary tragedies, which have accompanied the ostracism of this people, the sanctified figure in black has invariably turned up as the immediate plotter and arch-villain.

If on the whole, therefore, Mormons do not rush to fill the sectarian churches established in our midst; if the advances of sectarian ministers are received with an undercurrent of distrust and suspicion; if they fail to interest, let alone convert us,—the reason, in part at least, lies evidently in their general attitude of contempt for us, and especially in the history of their dealings with us as a people.

II.

THE HOLINESS OF THE MORMON CRUSADE.

But the supercilious treatment accorded us by Christian ministers is, after all, only the minor, the superficial reason for our mutual antagonism. We are not morbidly sensitive, nor do we cherish a spirit of re-

taliation. Were we a secluded or insular people, sect-narrowness might perpetuate the memory of wrongs and stimulate the desire for revenge—as it no doubt did in the older days; but what with two thousand Elders constantly on missions, and returning every two or three years laden with ideas and observations from every quarter of the globe, we are fast becoming the most cosmopolitan people under the sun; and a cosmopolitan people are not very likely to hold a grudge.

Besides, we are too often buffeted and bruised to harbor our injuries long. Let any minister meet us fairly and squarely on the plane of equality, and there is no house of worship throughout Mormondom that would be closed against him, as many notable incidents of the kind already attest.

The real reason why the ministers and the Mormons are as oil and water, lies deeper. What the Reverend Mr. Thompson says, contains a substantial truth. If being "educated, reformed, civilized," means being converted to his way of looking at things, then—well—like the rest of mankind, we have learned, when in a dilemma, to choose the lesser evil; we prefer the crushing,—whatever that may signify.

The reverend gentleman must not think, however, that his reasons for such harsh treatment are either new or novel; such a justification has invariably been working the basis of every religious crusade that has darkened the history of the world; save, perhaps, that where the bigots of former times proceeded in the name of God, this later Dominic invokes the name of civilization.

It is by no means impossible that we are on the eve of a new crusade; especially in view of the painful memories of Mormons still living. Do you think the thorns and thistles of the Middle ages forgot to cast their seed? Neither did the Inquisitors and witch-burners. The universal prate about liberty of conscience signifies nothing. No persecutors ever proceeded as conscious persecutors; nor did contemporary popular sentiment recognize them for what they were.

Religious bigotry is discernible, save by the few, only in perspective. It is ever a past, never a present vice, of any people. Couched in the cant phrases of the prevailing popular movement, it seems the very incarnation of purity and progress. The one persistent element in it,—if indeed, we may not call it the motive power—is hate;

an element which should make even enthusiasm pause; but this very quality itself—this bitterness and hate—masquerades as the supreme religious virtue—a righteous valor against iniquity.

Now, as the crushing process has more than once been tried against the Latter-day Saints, why should it not be tried again? And as the "reform" demanded of us in the past has invariably meant "conform," and consequently has failed,—I am grateful for the opportunity of pointing out why any new attempt to crush ought not to be made, and if made, why it ought to fail, as it surely will. In other words, I am grateful for this opportunity of putting the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints into sharp contrast with the "isms" whose efforts to bring us into line, so far from having developed increased Christian patience and longsuffering in their promoters, have, I very much fear, ended only in balked and vindictive rage.*

---

*Let me disclaim any intention of arraigning ministers of the Gospel in general, save as they resemble our job lot in Utah. These latter have declared war on us, and are therefore legitimate targets for my polemical harpoons. Unable to agree among themselves on tenet and doctrine, they have yet found, deep down in their spirit-

Mr. Elbert Hubbard, (Cosmopolitan, October, 1902), in reviewing, with Philistine pen, the factors that would make for the Millennium, places this condition first: viz., "Men will decline to join a social club that calls itself a 'church'."

I do not take it that Mr. Hubbard condemns churches in toto—only those which have degenerated into fashionable clubs, and so hinder social progress. Let us, then, take this admirable criterion of the fitness of any church to survive: viz., its social effectiveness or inherent power to help usher in the millennium; not on some world-to-be, but here on the third planet of the solar system. And by the result of such a comparison, let it be judged whether Mormonism ought to be crushed—or cultivated.

III.

REAL SOURCE OF A VIRILE FAITH.

The virility of religion as an ethical modifier of the human family lies, at the last analysis, in its conception of God. Faith

ual bosoms, a common bond of union—hatred of the Mormons. Just now they are unusually tolnabby, to use an Indian phrase, over the prospect of unseating Senator Smoot.

righteousness—or else to nullify—all the aspirations and deeds of men.

Along with this conception of God, the man whose faith is to help remove mountains (of sin), must have a conception of mankind equally definite and clear. He must feel himself categorically a child of God; differing, indeed, in degree but not in kind from his Father in heaven; potentially free as a moral agent, and actually free, to the extent that he has emancipated himself from sin; capable of "becoming perfect as God is perfect." (Matthew 5: 48.)

Such faith, and faith in such objects, is enjoined on almost every page of Holy writ; and as long as mankind worshiped the God in whose image (physical as well as otherwise) man was created; who walked as a man walks, in the garden of Eden; who conversed with Noah as one man converses with another; whose glorified person Moses beheld on Mt. Sinai; whose voice said in articulate words to John the Baptist: "This is my beloved Son;" whom Stephen, the first martyr, looking into heaven, saw side by side with the risen Redeemer; whom John the Revelator saw, seated on a great white throne,—as long, I repeat, as mankind believed actively in the

dynamic enough to make for the betterment of the race, must be centered in a Being that can be both loved and feared. The first requisite, therefore, is that He be a Reality, not a metaphysical abstraction; and the second, that He be a sympathetic Reality. In the words of Paul, we must first believe that He IS, and next that He is a REWARDER of them that diligently seek Him.

In that word rewarder, lie summed up the foremost qualities which a live faith requires in its divine source. There must be felt, first of all, a relationship equivalent to that of parent and child, with all the best qualities which our own lives have taught us to associate with father and mother; mercy, forgivenesss, daily guidance, anxiety, protection, a haven of refuge on earth, and ultimately an eternal home. And we must, moreover, feel that we can safely multiply these parent-qualities as many times in effectiveness, as we conceive God to be greater than man.

On the other hand, as a salutary restrainer of evil tendencies, we must feel God to be the omnipotent creator and preserver of all things; whose omniscient eye beholds even our secret thoughts, and whose omnipresent power and spirit pervades to shape towards

Christ-type of God, their faith was a living, virile force, which shaped their daily lives in directions known peculiarly to themselves and the eye of their Maker.

Then came the expansion of man's idea of the physical universe, and with it the mistaken demands of reason for a conception of God commensurate with the new ideas of infinitude. Greek philosophy offered such a conception. St. John's remark, that "God is a spirit," was accordingly made the scriptural point of departure, from the "God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," to the God of Buddha.

Into Buddha's cold abstraction, theologians have since been trying to inject the warm qualities of Jehovah,—with what success from an academic point of view, let the contradictions of metaphysics bear witness; with what failure in the ethical betterment of the race, let the apathy and artificiality of the so-called liberal or intellectualized churches of today declare!

Let us look more narrowly into this question of the Source of virility in religion. The only conception that any people can possibly have of Deity, is one which comes within their mental horizon—the horizon bounded by their experience. Into his personality

they will think their highest and noblest ideals. What they love most, fear most, admire most, will somehow be found among his attributes. To the extent, and in the direction that they are civilized and enlightened, to that extent and in that direction will He be idealized.

It was therefore a profound remark of our Savior, that to know God is to have eternal life. No one can know him save as he becomes like Him. To know him absolutely is therefore to be perfect as He is perfect, which of course could be nothing else than eternal life.

By the same reasoning, to know Him in part is to be like Him in part, and therefore to be saved in part; or, to generalize, we are saved (i. e., we have eternal life assured unto us) no faster than we learn to know God; in other words, no faster than we become like Him.

But becoming like him implies a progressive means of getting ideas about Him. Let us take time to see how this thought works out in practice.

IV.

TO KNOW GOD IS TO BECOME LIKE HIM.

To know God is to have adequate notions of his personality in, say, five different as-

pects; physically, intellectually, socially, morally, and spiritually. Manifestly these notions can come to man only as God reveals them. The germ ideas respecting his personality are to be found in scripture; but these are meaningless, save as man thinks into them the content of his experience. The real revelation of God to man is, therefore, to be found in that which gives man experience: in life—nature—law.

If a man would have the noblest ideal of God's physical personality, let him master all that is known of physiology and hygiene —and conform his own life thereto; if he would realize His intellectual personality, let him become familiar with the elements of intellect in man, then calculate what must be the Intellect that could create and control a solar system, with all the myriad forms of life and being therein manifested; if he would know God's social personality, let him study sociology, determine what qualities in man would lead to love and harmony: in the home, in the state, in the nation, in the world,—and then consider that God has so mastered these laws that heaven (ideal social harmony) is His habitat; and so of God's moral and spiritual personality: to the extent that man discovers and lives

moral and spiritual law,—to that extent will he know God.

It follows, therefore, from the very nature of things, that the honest man's conception of God is a progressively growing ideal. As, day by day, he discovers law, (truth), and especially as he conforms his life to law, (obeys truth), so must his ideal of the Ordainer of law change; and let no council of ecclesiastics presume to lay an embargo on his soul, by pronouncing once for all what God is or is not.

But this latter was precisely what St. Augustine and his brother monks tried to do for mankind. Consider for a moment with what possible hope of success. How much did these men know of that greater revelation of God, the book of nature, which flooded the last century with light? Interpreting Deity, as perforce they must, by the content of their experience, think what a narrow emanation of the life of the Dark ages their conception must be!

What of his physical personality, considered from the standpoint of ascetics,—men who despised the human body as something viler than the rags of a beggar?

What of his intellectual personality, in-

terpreted by an age dogmatic and unscientific to the last degree?

What of his social and moral personality, mirrored in the imaginations of men, whose highest social ideal was to shirk all contact with, and responsibility for the world, by living in caves, convents, and monasteries?

What of his spiritual personality, judged of by the beings who wore stones away with their knees believing that mere adoration was pleasing to him?

Is it any wonder, then, that when men began to study science; when they went direct to nature for their ideas; when they read God's purpose concerning man by studying man himself, especially in his relation to social evolution,—is it any wonder, that they turned away from the artificial conception promulgated by theologians?

For was not this idea of God, after all, only an intensified conception of the mediaeval monarch; whose approbation was to be gained, and whose anger was to be appeased, through the mediation of court-favorites, (saints, angels, the Virgin Mary, the Son of God), who might be bribed or cajoled into pleading the sinner's cause?

Such a conception could not coexist with

ideals attained through the larger generalizations of life. To find pleasure in the servile prostration of multitudes, is not now conceived a noble trait, even in kings; less, therefore, in the King of kings.

To make life and death dependent on the mere caprice of human will, we have now come to believe unjust and dangerous, and accordingly have substituted the reign of human law; in the same way, eternal life has come to be conceived as dependent, not upon the favor or anger of Deity, (in the mediaeval sense), but upon divine law.

But, as before intimated, in this shifting of the ultimate Source of volition and responsibility, a great mistake was made. Instead of stripping from the Christ or Bible type of Deity, all the vagaries and artificialties in which He had been clothed during the Dark ages, and then reclothing him according to the truer ideals of modern life, scientists overthrew the Type itself, and theologians eventually put in its place a vague generalization of spirit, from the notion that this would patch up the growing breach between science and religion.

I repeat that a great mistake was made—which I should have no fear of demonstrating, did space permit; for, after all, what

but rather with the idea that Mormonism may have something new and entirely worthy of modern thought; for however true of the Augustinian conception, Carlyle's jibe of "an absentee God, sitting idle ever since the first Sabbath on the outside of his universe, and seeing it go"—has no meaning whatever in the conception believed in by Latter-day Saints.

V.

COMMON GROUND BETWEEN MORMON AND CHRISTIAN.

Let us take time now to see what Mormon philosophy and modern Christian philosophy have in common, albeit under different names.

Perhaps Mr. Fiske, in his "Idea of God," states most clearly the Christian hypothesis when he says: "The world of phenomena is intelligible only when regarded as the multiform manifestation of an OMNIPOTENT Energy that is in some way—albeit in a way quite above our finite comprehension—anthropomorphic or quasi-personal. There is a true objective reasonableness in the universe; its events have an orderly progression, and so far as those events are

type of creative intelligence, other than the man-type, can the race possibly come in contact with? Why, then, throw away the teaching of experience, from some fancy that it may be inadequate, and build upon non-experience, which we know is inadequate?

The point of the foregoing discussion, so far as this booklet is concerned, is this: Mormonism, though starting, as it did, in the blaze of a scientific age, yet took for its object of worship the Bible type of God; but it did not load itself down with the incubus of mediaeval interpretation.

Like Christ, God is conceived as the perfect, man; but as to the meaning of "perfected," no theologian of the past, however wise in the estimation of Christendom, can have a voice: each man knows God to the extent that he has grown like him; and he has grown like Him to the extent that he has discovered and obeyed law.

Mormonism thus finds in life, not in metaphysical speculation, its commentary upon scripture. Accordingly, let the reader come to its investigation not with the pre-judgment that he is to witness the setting up again of a conception which has fallen a hundred times in previous polemical battles;

brought sufficiently within our ken for us to generalize them exhaustively, their progression is toward a goal recognizable by human intelligence. * * * * * * Such a theory of things is Theism. It recognizes an Omnipresent Energy, which is none other than the living God."

With all which Mormonism is in perfect accord, save the last clause. Instead of being itself the living God, this omnipresent energy is regarded as merely a palpable evidence of the living God.

Suppose no mortal being had ever seen the sun, nor any other heavenly body to give him the suggestion of its existence,—yet its effects on the earth remained precisely as they are, excepting perhaps the phenomena of shadow. Under such circumstances, could the scientist be persuaded that the phenomena of light, heat, actinism, magnetism, and electricity were not immediate expresssions of an omnipresent energy, but were in fact effects of a cause localized in space?

If he could, it ought not to be difficult to conceive the Mormon idea of God; not indeed as that omnipresent energy, nor even as the creator of that energy—for it is self existent, eternal—but as the efficient Cause

of its differentiation into the forces known to man.

To quote Mr. Fiske again: "The fathomless abysses of space can no longer be talked of as empty; they are filled with a wonderful substance, unlike any of the forms of matter which we can weigh and measure. A cosmic jelly infinitely hard and elastic, it offers at the same time no appreciable resistance to the movements of the heavenly bodies. It is so sensitive that a shock in any part of it causes 'a tremor which is felt on the surface of countless worlds.' Radiating in every direction, from millions of centric points, run shivers of undulation manifested in endlesss metamorphoses as heat, or light, or actinism, as magnetism or electricity. Crossing one another in every imaginable way as if all space were crowded with a mesh-work of nervethreads, these motions go on forever in a harmony that nothing disturbs. * * * *

"It means that the universe as a whole is thrilling with Life—not, indeed, life in the usual restricted sense, but life in a general sense. The distinction once deemed absolute, between the living and the not-living, is converted into a relative distinction; and Life as manifested in the organism is seen

to be only a specialized form of the Universal Life."

All this Mormonism believes implicitly, and goes one better. As early as 1832, seven years before Mohr announced the law of the conservation and correlation of energy, Joseph Smith identified all the cosmic forces with which man is familiar as differentiations of one supreme Force; declaring, moreover,—and this is where Mormonism is still in advance of the age,—that man's ability to perceive truth—the power variously known as inspiration, genius, intellectual penetration—is only a higher power of this same "infinite and eternal Energy;" that is to say, just as a certain rate of vibration of ether gives the sensation of heat, and another rate the sensation of light, so still other rates, progressively varied, account for all the psychic states resulting from our perceptions, respectively, of the many-angled aspects of a single supreme Force—the one universal harmony of Truth.

But this power is not God: it is merely the medium through which He works, plus His will impressed upon the medium. Without the medium, God would be helpless to execute, while still retaining all his power to

invent. Without God, the medium would remain changeless, inert, throughout all eternity, having no power of initiation within itself.

This medium, which is coextensive with the universe, would, if unimpressed by God, perhaps present no attrition (i. e. no phenomena) to the present state of our intelligence; the alternative fact, that this medium does present attrition to our senses, is therefore only another way of saying that God by virtue of his will is 'in all things, through all things, above all things, below all things' —the animating principle of the created universe.

To put the distinction in scriptural terms, what Christians recognize as God the Father, Latter-day Saints perceive to be the Holy Ghost (i. e. the universal medium colored by the will of God). Christ himself draws this distinction: "Howbeit when He the spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak." Showing that the power of initiation does not lie with the Holy Ghost but with God.

The failure to keep this distinction in mind is explicable perhaps on the ground

that it is only through this universal medium that God's will is made to bear upon man; just as it is only through the medium of the ether that the sun can influence the earth. Nevertheless such failure to perceive the distinction between God and the medium through which He works does not differ in kind from that which should fail to see the architect and builder behind the gray-granite temple in Salt Lake City. It is, in fact, a blindness of the same kind as that which would postulate an "all-soul" residing in the materials used, as the adequate cause of the phenomena presented in all the mutations of the materials.

And yet preposterous as seems this last supposition, let us see how nearly true it is, in fact. The gray-granite quarry,—to use again my illustration of the Temple,—exists only by virtue of the "infinite and eternal energy," which Christians identify with God, but which Latter-day Saints identify with the basic medium of the Holy Ghost; so do all other materials used, and so also do the architect and builders themselves; indeed, the very intelligence necessary to plan the Temple, and all the mechanical powers used in its construction, are trans-

mutations, more or less remote, of this same universal spirit.

What remains then for its finite creators? The initiative, and in a relative sense, the masterv of the materials and forces involved in its construction.

Here then we come face to face with the essential characteristic of God: the power of initiative and the mastery of materials and forces; not indeed mastery and control in the clumsy, mechanical fashion in which man seeks to imitate creative intelligence; but in the absolute triumph of mind over not-mind. In these two facts,—the power to invent and the will to execute,—lies the supremacy of God over the universe, even though He himself be limited in form to the Christ-type of being.

In no other way are creation and control intelligible to man; for to place initiative and the mastery of the materials and forces in the materials and forces themselves, is unthinkable. It is a postulate that never has appealed and never can appeal to the experience of man, and, is therefore no more worthy of credence than are the vagaries of Buddha's dream; among which, indeed, it stands foremost.

If the Source of the Mormon religion—

and what we believe should be the Source of all virile religion—is thus made clear, I am ready to answer the next pertinent question connected with this general comparison: What is the true place of religion in the economy of life?

VI.

RELIGION AS A SPECIAL FUNCTION OF LIFE.

"Religion," says one of the growing crop of corrosive pens, "religion—the childish mistaking of pictures for facts,—the crass materialization of allegory,—the infinite talent of man for humbugging himself,—and underneath it all the shadowy outline of Truth."

It is something to be an iconoclast—there is work for him among the tottering, ivy-grown institutions that are out-living the ages when they really severed mankind; it is more to be a builder. The philistine I have just quoted assumes to be the arbiter of religion as well as the oracle of Truth. Verily, we have progressed since Pilate's day. Here is a man who not only knows what Truth is, but is able to recognize her outline even when shadowy. Or is he after all only a phrase-maker?

It seeems to me the utterest folly to attempt a generalization of religion in a single stroke. He who can do it, knows too much for this world, and should promptly take his seat among the angels; or else he knows too little, and should have the fostering care of a mental hospital.

Nevertheless, some broad lines of differentiation need to be drawn between what, in religion, tends to serve and what tends to hinder the evolution of the human race. With this reservation, then, that our findings are to be regarded only as a groping after the truth, let us face the question. What should be the place of religion in the economy of life?

In a previous chapter I took the ground that a religion to be virile enough to make for the betterment of the race, must be founded on a living faith—faith in a Being who can be both loved and feared; also that the first requisite of such a faith is, that the Object of it be a Reality not a metaphysical abstraction, and the second requisite that He be a sympathetic Reality.

But if religion is to be regarded as a gilded something superimposed upon life, a society for the culture, and especially for the display, of a religiously veneered estheti-

cism, then there is little need of real faith—the less indeed the better. Its immaculate pastors can, with a long pair of scriptural tongs, dip for themes into the turbid stream of life, and so escape soiling their white hands by contact with men and women still of the earth earthy.

Its votaries, placidly conscious that they are already saved, can sit back in cushioned pews, while sin is idealized salvation dramatized, and a sense of their own righteousness is distilled upon them like dew. The Church will thus remain eminently holy and respectable, and will draw to its fold all the I-am-holier-than-thou worshipers who can afford the luxury.

True, along with this heaven-tending, selective culture, there are likely to grow a few incidental evils; such as, artificial righteousness, spiritual snobbery, religious shams and make-believes, a sniveling, psalm-singing cant, and hypocrisy unadulterated; but then who expects, in this vale of tears, to find any garden of holiness without a few weeds here and there?

It is this conception of religion, so widely prevalent among Christian sects of today,—the fashionable church retaining, to use the language of scripture, "the form of Godli-

ness, but lacking the power thereof,"—that Elbert Hubbard and his school of iconoclasts are inveighing against. Lay on, ye philistines; a ranker sham, a more bedizzened artificiality, does not grow in the field of social progress today.

Religion may next be conceived as a divine something which is to be integrated or interwoven with life; a daily and hourly burnisher of the conscience; an unostentatious something that goes with a man to the field, the work shop, or the office, and guides through love or restrains through fear all the thoughts and acts, great and small, which make up the warp and woof of his complex life.

This conception involves, on the one side, a fervid, perhaps unreasoning faith in the ever-present love of God, or at least of the Savior; and on the other, the total depravity or essential vileness of human life, in and of itself.

Man is conceived as belonging to an order of being somewhat above the ants, and somewhat below the angels; with power to rise, through the medium of religion, into the heavenly spheres, but doomed without its power, to sink to the depths of hell.

This conception really represents a stage

rather than a kind of religion. It represents the dogmatic, just as the first conception represents the philosophic, stage of almost every sect in Christendom. It is, however, distinctly a factor in the social betterment of the race; as witness the present efforts of the Salvation Army.

The difference between these two conceptions lies in the fact that the first is not only itself a holy sham, but a breeder of correlative social shams—a religion which at best "but skins and films the ulcerous places" in society; while the second is an earnest, whole-souled effort to probe, cleanse, and fill with health the putrescent moral nature of man. The defect of both alike lies in the fact that they are mere specialized functions of life; seeking to do for the soul by spiritual unction, what the physician tries to do for the body with drop and pill.

VII.

RELIGION CONCEIVED AS LIFE ITSELF.

There is still a third conception of the right place of religion; not as something superimposed upon life, nor as something integrated with life, but as life itself—life from God's point of view, which is the only real, true, eternal life.

This is the central thought of Mormonism. God is conceived as the Father—in a very literal sense—of the spirits of all men. He must himself therefore be, like Christ, a glorified, perfected man. These spirits, again like Christ, their elder brother, lived a spiritually organized, premortal life, perhaps for thousands, perhaps for millions of years; and the ego, the I AM, or principle of self-consciousness, never had a beginning.

This earth by the Mormon conception, is not a pestilent island in the ocean of eternity, where souls are quarantined for sin, as the dismalists among Christians would have us believe; on the contrary, it is a world prepared by our Father in heaven for the transplanting of his children; a glorious university—the only real university— for the development of His sons and daughters.

These sons and daughters do not belong to an order of being lower than that of God himself, and are therefore not "totally depraved;" their so-called deformities of sin are, for the most part, merely the deformities incident to growth and development; the deformities of the scaffolding as compared with the perfected house.

Sin itself as ordinarily understood is little

else than relative righteousness; that is to say, what would be sin for a higher order of intelligence is often virtue for a lower. This is not denying, however, that there is real sin, recognizable alike in all grades of being; nor that there is a real Devil, capable of tempting men to evil.

From the conception that earth-life is a definitely-planned, and very necessary part in the eternal education of man, it follows that heaven is not some impossible region, remote in time and space, to which the soul flies at death; heaven is the HERE and NOW, and a million years hence in the life of the soul, will still be the here and now.

That is to say, heaven is always a present, not a future, state of the soul; and if any being would know the extent,—the height, depth, and breadth,—of bliss which the universe has in store for him at any time, let him take stock of how much heavenly beauty he sees, and feels, and LIVES, in the creations immediately around him.

His future Here and Now will no doubt be ineffably enhanced in glory; but only on the condition that the beauties and glories between the present and the future state shall have been progressively seen, and felt, and lived; only on the condition that he pro-

gressively accumulate in himself what Dr. Jordan calls the higher heredity.

Let him not foolishly imagine that he can fly from the one state into the other; for the farther he would go, either backward or forward from the here and now of any stage in his progress, the more deeply he would sink into hell.

For what is the essential fact of hell if not a state of discord with one's surroundings? Just as heaven represents the upward, forward, positive point of view—the life that seeks law to the end that it may come more and more into harmony with God; so hell is the negative, reactionary, rebellious point of view—the life which, opposing itself to the harmony of the universe, is in process of being undone. It was with profound insight that Goethe made Mephistopheles declare: "I am the spirit that denies."

It follows from such a conception that there are as many varying degrees of hell as there are of heaven. Our present state in fact may be either heaven or hell according to the direction in which the soul's aspirations are pointed. He who says, "Father, thy will be done" is in heaven,—as exquisite a heaven as his soul is capable of,—

with angels and all the positive forces of the universe surrounding him. He who has not yet learned to take this mental attitude, is groping in neutral shades; he who denies it, is in hell; for he opposes himself to law, and makes all things eternal his enemies. And as by obedience to law, he built up all the power of his psychic life, so now his opposition to law must result in stripping him of that power. This latter state is what is meant by being damned,—a state in which the soul has lost the power to repent and come into harmony with God.*

The tortures of hell can be only approximately imagined from the relatively short psychic basis of our natural life. Nevertheless, to feel a growing sense of confusion and discord about one; to realize the insidi-

*Christ speaks of a sin that is unpardonable—the sin against the Holy Ghost. Paul in speaking of those who "were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, and then fell away," declares that it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance. Here then is the unpardonable sin; for, manifestly, if a man cannot repent he cannot be forgiven. Men in respect of obedience to God are like beacon-fires: as long as a spark of the divine life remains, it can be kindled unto repentance; but suppose it goes out—can you rekindle ashes? The sons of perdition are merely the ash-heaps of divine fires that have gone out.

ous approach of spiritual impotence, as revealed periodically in actions which more and more tend to terminate in empty, useless rage; to feel one's power slipping away, and realize that the time will inevitably come when, coupled with an awareness that shall know all heights and depths, there will be an absolute helplessness to re-act upon the universe; in short, to feel one's self becoming a keenly self-conscious piece of drift-wood on the waves of eternity—this it is what probably constitutes the supreme agony of the damned.

But in a relative sense, the pains of hell evidently result from being out of joint with one's environment; and getting out of joint would, as before suggested, result from arbitrarily moving either forward or backward from any given point of soul-development. If, for instance, some devout Christian, with mechanical ideas of salvation, should have his prayer granted and suddenly be transplanted into the presence of God and angels,—supposing that his earthly dress could actually withstand a glory intenser than the atmosphere of the sun,—what would he find in this advanced psychic universe with which to form soul-correspondences? What would he find as food for

interest, delight, or even for comprehension in an environment exquisitely poised to beings psychically millions of ages perhaps ahead of him? Practically he would be in hell—the hell of utter barrenness and monotony.

So, on the other hand, were he suddenly put back into environments whose elementary crudeness once formed delightful soul-attrition, but whose power to shape and modify, and therefore to interest him, he has long out-grown,—what would be the state of his feelings? Fancy a Mozart or Wagner condemned to linger in a plane where "Yankee Doodle" and the "Arkansaw Traveler" were among the highest types of musical concord! Again he would be in hell—this time in the hell of psychic nausea and boredom; than which let no man this side of the gulf of the damned fear a worse fate.

Mormonism, it will be thus seen, has nothing in it to encourage the delusion of those Christians who believe themselves already saved, and who, in consequence, dally with the present life in listless fashion while waiting for the advent of their paradise; Mormonism is pre-eminently the religion of present endeavor.—

"Trust no future, howe'er pleasant
Let the dead past bury its dead;
Act—act in the living present,
Heart within and God o'erhead."

He obeys God best who learns most of the present world, but in such order and relation that the link between him and his maker becomes daily brighter and stronger; he is in the highest heaven who sees most beauty, feels most harmony, in the creations immediately around him.

Compare, then, with a religion so outlined—a religion vitally inter-related with all real things; indeed, an interpreter of all things in their relation to the soul,—the puerile definition with which the previous chapter opened: "Religion—the childish mistaking of pictures for facts,—the crass materialization of allegory,—the infinite talent of man for humbugging himself,—and underneath it all, the shadowy outline of Truth."

Verily, some owls hoot—others write.

VIII.

ABORTIVE RELIGION MAKING.

To Latter-day Saints, who have been accustomed to looking at the human race as exhibiting, while on earth, the essential

present, or time-link in an endless chain of divine being, the conclusions reached in the preceding chapters will be regarded quite as matter of fact; but to the modern Christian world, long imbued with the notion that mankind is a subsidiary creation,—an order of being quite different from and inferior to that of God himself,—I can well imagine they will seem little short of blasphemous; and therefore also that, though they cannot be refuted, they will not readily be accepted.

It seems pertinent therefore to close the series with a chapter based on this point of view: Granted that these conclusions are false, what follows? What other teleological vistas, forward and backward, are left to the race?

As a preliminary, it may be remarked that whatever be the nature of those other vistas,—however unscientific they may be shown to be by comparison—my showing them to be so will not materially affect the multiplication of religions; for in respect of the tenet-creating tendency human beings may not unfitly be likened to a thrifty young orchard. The religious feeling is in them even as the sap is in the trees,—a sort of dumb, emotional potentiality ever seeking opportunity to express itself in forms of de-

votion. Now, as there is evidently a natural evolution of the tree—into forms representing God's ideals, and crowned with lucious fruit; so there must evidently be a natural evolution of this religious feeling. And as a judicious orchardist can, by proper digging and pruning, materially assist the unfolding and fructivity of the tree, so there is manifestly a place for the pastor in the natural and spiritual evolution of mankind.

But note now the alternative: if the orchardist be actuated by artificial ideas, he may prune the growing tendency of his trees into all sorts of abortive forms—resembling nothing else in the natural world;—with this penalty, however, that he will get no fruit. So also may the religious enthusiast, guided by fantastic interpretations of scripture, or the still more erratic conclusions of occult speculation, prune and shape the emotional tendencies of his congregation. May—did I say?—he has, he does; for how else can you account for the ten thousand varieties of psychic contortion that pass and have passed for religion among mankind?

That such abortive religions will never yield fruits of eternal life—and by such fruits I mean increased present power in

the individual: physically, intellectually, socially, morally, and spiritually—is best proved by the fact that they generally postpone such fruits to a hypothetical future; whereas, it is next thing to a truism that the religion which does not yield its rewards in the heaven of the Here and Now, will never—because it can never—yield them in eternity.

What then is the remedy for abortive religion-making? Precisely the same as that which we have already applied to abortive tree-culture. That remedy is to let nature alone,—which involves finding out what is nature, and then removing all artificial obstructions, so that she may be alone. Are men less subject to natural law than trees? Do we prune and shape a growing tree by the speculations of seers and mahatmas—or the vagaries of Christian Science? Then, in God's name, let us cease ignoring the laws of nature which constitute man's physical and spiritual environment: cease calling phenomena illusions—cease to go whoring after phantasmal "realities."

For if anything is fixed and certain it is this: that he who rises above his present environment—his present sum-total of impinging phenomena, if you please—is pre-

pared for a higher, nobler sphere,—a sphere more difficult and therefore more full of truth-surprises; and the evidence is this, that his power of bliss is within him, not stored away in a hypothetical heaven. And he who lets present environment rise above him, must inevitably sink to a lower, cruder, more monotonous level; and the evidence is this, that his weakness or damnation is within him, not locked up in some hypothetical hell.

Mormonism in taking such a stand merely voices what seems obviously the principles of common sense. They are, in fact, the principles which must underlie the application of scientific thinking to matters religious. If such thinking were made the criterion of religious truth—as it is of every other form of truth,—how, like punctured wind-bags, would the swelling spiritual "isms" of the day fall flat over the face of the earth!

To have weight or effect, however, such thinking would have to be applied by the religion-makers themselves, scientists being regarded as the natural enemies of religion. But if religious leaders were fitted by scientific training for such thinking, there would be no gas-blown theories of salvation to

puncture. Men would have recognized long ago the natural connection between this world of ours with its varied phenomena and the education of the human soul for eternal life.

It will thus be found that religions of the unscientific kind have no teleological vistas either of the past or of the future; merely a precipitous starting point, creation, with no indication of how or why, a more or less artificial earth-life, in which the supreme good seems to be to get as little entangled with things earthy as possible, and lastly a final jump-off—into heaven or hell.

As to the significance of these final states, we get little more of rational perspective than is contained in the child's "good-place" and "bad-place." True, of heaven and hell word-painting, designed to dazzle or terrorize the sinner, we have lurid examples enough in the sermons of revivalism; but the moment they are subjected to three consecutive scientific questions, they shrivel and fade into what they are—mere reckless products of imagination gone mad.

And it is for this reason, no doubt, that the religions of the day deny the right of science to question them; and in order that religion-makers may be quite free from its

attacks, the domain of religious belief is postulated as being a vague, spiritual country beyond the territory of reason; whose methods of cultivation are so diverse from those of the intellect, that they present no analogies even, let alone examples of common ground. It is difficult to see how the conditions of spiritual gullibility could well be improved beyond this.

IX.

MYSTERY AND VACUITY VERSUS MORMONISM.

When we consider the nature of the ultimate facts which Christian religionists seek to maintain, there is small wonder that they are driven to such dilemmas as those set forth in the last chapter. The God they postulate is so unlike any concept of experience that, by their own confession, he transcends all analogy. Indeed, "A God understood is a God dethroned," has long stood for a truism among them.

Nevertheless, they are driven, perforce, to make this primal Mystery act, since the world is to be created and peopled, and religion must somehow come to bless mankind; accordingly, they postulate subaltern mysteries one after another; such as, that

the earth was made out of nothing; that man's soul is the breath of Deity; that the transition between the natural and the spiritual world is abysmal; that man is saved solely by the merits of Jesus, without reference to works; that heaven is so unlike earth that we can form no conception of it; and so on through all the vague categories of modern Christianity.

As is their conception of God, so of a piece are all its corollaries; with the result that religion has become a ghostly creature compelled to lurk only in those dark corners where the light of science cannot penetrate, and its priests a body of soothsayers afraid to speak with authority, save on matters beyond the province of verification; or else a system of belief demanding constant soul stultification on the part of its adherents: the holding of opposite views in science and religion, and justifying the contradiction on the thin assumption that the two planes of being are different.

Contrast with all this vacuity the positiveness of Mormonism, and the logical inevitableness of its doctrines. Instead of the mechanical cosmogony of sectarianism, opposed alike to science and reason, trace through the scheme of salvation, as taught

by Latter-day Saints, that same golden thread of truth which has unified the researches of science,—the principle of evolution, or as we call it, the principle of eternal progress; not evolution drifting along the line of least resistance, but evolution directed at every step by creative intelligence.

Finally, remember that this religion, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, was the one and only religion in all the world denied representation in the World's Congress of religions during the late Chicago Fair. Was it not a unique, an enviable distinction to have thrust upon us?

Christ spoke of a certain rock which had been rejected by all the builders, but which nevertheless became the chief corner-stone. Can you blame the Mormons for the unalterable conviction that in the restoration, through Joseph Smith, of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in its pristine purity and with all its keys and powers, including authority to officiate in his name, God is fulfilling anew that very striking prediction?

And speaking of the builders who rejected that stone brings me to a consideration again of the occasion which led to the writing of this booklet,—the concerted movements of various ministerial bodies, fol-

lowing in the wake of the Presbyterian General Assembly North, with a view to "crushing" Mormonism.

I trust I have given these zealous imitators(!) of Christ some rational idea of the real work before them. I hope they will realize that the mud-slinging they have indulged in during the past—the Danite canards, the Mountain Meadow horror (deplored as much by Mormons as by Gentiles), and the charges of Mormon ignorance and immorality—will not suffice to aid them with any candid reader of these pages: they must meet the truths and arguments here set forth, or go back to their wooden creeds defeated.

Will they attempt it? No. Judged by their past record, they will appeal again to the refuge of lies; they will cull some fragments from this treatise which lend themselves to distortion and misrepresentation. These, taken from the context, they will overthrow and cover with ridicule, and then pose as champions. To paraphrase Dr. Johnson's famous saying, as the only utterance that promises my feelings any relief: "Holiness is often the last refuge of the scoundrel!"

I do not speak thus bitterly against minis-

ters in general: only against the tribe that conceive it to be evidence of holiness to attack and vilify the Mormons. May God still give me charity to remember that they are my brethren!

The limits of this booklet preclude the further development of a theme which opens with surprising interest in almost every direction of human thought; but enough has perhaps been said to give kindly disposed people a criterion for measuring this new interpretation of the religion of Jesus Christ which we Mormons fervently believe has come to bless mankind; enough also, let me hope, to show that Mormonism and polygamy are separate things: or if they have been related (by practice) in the past and are related (by belief) at present, the relation has been and is that of a tree and a single leaf on the tree. Mormonism involves in its reach the whole universe; polygamy, even when most widely practiced, involved only three per cent of the Latter-day Saints,—themselves a mere handful of people.

To the reader who is interested in the general views here set forth and who desires to investigate more specifically, the author takes this occasion of announcing a new

book (now in press) entitled "Scientific Aspect of Mormonism," also a companion volume (now being written) entitled "Social Aspect of Mormonism." In these volumes religion in general and Mormonism in particular, are considered more at length in their relation to the scientific thought of the day.

X.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, let me quote again the Rev. Charles Thompson's brave(!) words before the Presbyterian general assembly at Los Angeles, May 26, 1903: "It [the Mormon Church] is not to be educated, not to be civilized, not to be reformed—it must be crushed. No other organization is so perfect as the Mormon Church, except the German Army."

The newspaper account of this meeting sets forth that no other proceedings of the conference received such vociferous applause as did Rev. Thompson's denunciation of Mormonism—a statement not difficult to believe, since the synod took definite action as a body against the Mormon people and religion. Be this as it may, let us analyze

the above sample of fervid, anti-Mormon eloquence.

In the first place, when the reverend gentleman admits in one breath the faultless organization of the Mormon Church, and urges in another that it must be crushed, is he not guilty of very cheap rhetoric—not to say thinly disguised bathos? Is it not like saying, "The Mormon Church being perfect in its organization, is uncrushable—therefore it must be crushed!"

In the next place, his intemperate words arouse the query: "If Mormonism is so perfect in its organization, what has made it perfect?" The German army, as every one knows, is held together by the iron hand of coercion; but what is the source of Mormon cohesion? It cannot be fear, for every member enjoys the same freedom to enter, or leave the Church, that is enjoyed by members of other churches. Nor is it superstition, as the swift glimpse of Mormonism afforded by the foregoing pages must testify. Unlike other religions, Mormonism calls upon no one to swallow that which stultifies his reason. Nor is it ignorance—Mormonism from its first inception has waged a perpetual campaign against spiritual darkness and superstition. Indeed, "No

man can be saved in ignorance," and "A man is saved no faster than he gains intelligence,"—are household aphorisms with us.

We are thus driven to the only answer left: the inevitableness of Mormon organization, results directly from the inevitableness of Mormon doctrines. The cohesion of Mormonism is nothing else than the cohesion of truth in precept cleaving collectively unto truth in example,—precisely as we should expect, and as any one may know who will earnestly and prayerfully investigate its claims.

Mormonism presents to the world a new point of view for studying the meaning of life; a point of view so marvelous in its reach that it encompasses and ties together in one vast, rational unity all the truths known to the race.

But curiously enough, the ministers that come among us are the last people on earth who are willing or able to appreciate this point of view. Such has been the nature of their education for the ministry that Mormonism offends them at every point. "Eggregious materialism!" they exclaim. It is the only relief they can find for their offended sense of ministerial dignity.

Poor stuffed and starched automatons of

the theological seminary, with their upward-rolling eyes and teary voices, their ultra-specialized training and consequent narrow notions of religion as something connected with chapel services,—how could they be expected to estimate justly a religion which involves the sum total of man's ideas and activities; how appreciate the resultant social system, which is a more vital departure from the artificial holiness that, like the love-weed in our alfalfa, is blighting the healthy naturalism of our time,—than was the departure of science from the cosmogony of the Middle ages?

How, with the bias of the seminary upon them, can they feel anything like Christian charity for a religion which figures neither as a divine gilding upon life, nor as a divine influx into life, but as a transplanting of divine life itself upon this planet; which aims to sanctify and make holy every needful activity of man, and counts law wherever found, whether in nature or in revelation, as equally the voice of the living God?

How, with their prim notions of ministerial broad-cloth and immaculate shirt-bosoms, can they keep down a feeling of contempt for the Elder that plows and sows, the Seventy that shoes horses, the High

Priest that plasters your house, the Apostle that superintends a factory or presides over a bank,—for a body of ministers, in short—comprising almost the total male membership of the church—that do during week days whatever the exigencies of life call upon them to do, and preach if need be on Sundays?

Even in the narrow field affected by these ministers—that of spiritual matters—Mormonism presents a depth and richness of soil that would bring a harvest to their starving congregations, could they but get away from their hackneyed texts and commentaries long enough to dig into it. As it is, what have they to offer in lieu of the system they would crush? With what principles do they purpose to "reform, educate, and civilize" us?

It is conceivable that not all of these ministers have joined the Presbyterians in the crushing crusade; that some are in fact still intent upon our conversion by peaceable means. In order that these may be forearmed, and so know how to approach us, I purpose confiding to them some prejudices of the thoughtful, intelligent Mormon, who is acquainted with the deeper principles of his own faith, and also with what may be

gained of theirs from a study of their confesssions of faith.*

Well, then, to improvise an allegory, his own religion presents to him the aspect of a vigorous young tree; diversified in form and function, yet still bearing the stamp of a perfect unity; branch, and twig, and leaf, and flower, and fruit, each growing organically out of a greater something preceding; the whole filled and made alive by a mysterious power which is constantly sending its roots more deeply into the spiritual world, only to extend its beneficent sway more widely in the natural world.

Theirs—the religions of his would-be reformers—do not present to him the unity of even an artificial tree. They seem rather to be things wooden, built from timber cut for the most part during the dark ages, and nailed together—literally nailed—by the decrees of ecclesiastical councils. How some

*I am fully aware, however, that such creeds are not a just criterion of the best work being done by ministers of the gospel. Indeed, where men are really helping to shape the social destiny of the race, the chances are ten to one that they have overthrown their creeds and are drawing their inspiration from the scientific thought of the age. For such men I have the greatest reverence, and feel sure they will not take to themselves what I have said against the narrow, bigoted preachers that make so much fuss about reforming Latter-day Saints.

of these doctrines have hung to the rest of the illogical ensemble, during the enlightenment of the nineteenth century, is matter for wonder; as for instance, the doctrine of the creation of the world from nothing, of the predestination of man to heaven or hell, and of the damnation of unbaptized infants.†

I have said that such are the relative aspects of his own, as compared with other religions, to the thoughtful, philosophical Mormon; but the effect is precisely the same with the Mormon who never reasons back to final causes; for in his dumb way he still feels, by a kind of blanket intuition, the living unity and essential rationality of the one, and the artificiality and ineffectiveness of the other.

Having pleaded guilty for myself and my co-religionists to which definitely biased state of mind, I dare say I have done the worst thing possible, for our future peace and well-being; for what shall now restrain the rest of the body ministerial from giving up their angelic intentions toward us, and

†It is gratifying to know that the same Presbyterian General Assembly which resolved to open the crusade on the Mormons also pulled out from their creed the rusty nail represented by the last named doctrine. The other two, however, remain.

deserting to the campaign of the Presbyterian general assembly north? Have we not numerous examples of the facility with which sectaries unite when the object of attack is Mormonism?

Seriously, what is this crushing business to signify? Is the attack to be scriptural? It dare not be—these ministers know that too well from past experience. Educational? Equally impossible; Mormonism challenges comparison with the world. Political? Perhaps. But how shallow is the study of Mormonism which concludes that it can be swerved from its ideals by mere politcal circumvention! When the Hon. B. H. Roberts was refused his seat in the House of Representatives, the average minister no doubt rubbed his hands and chuckled at the crushing(!) blow that had been dealt to Mormonism. What a piece of inane fatuity! It affected the health of the "octopus" no more than would the plucking of a leaf affect a tree. Nor will the unseating of Senator Smoot do more, should these ministers succeed in their program. The real injury in such a case would be to the liberty and integrity of our beloved country.

But perhaps these holy men are dreaming of something more drastic; to which, in-

deed, political hindrances might be made a prelude. Perhaps disfranchisement, confiscation, expulsion, mob-violence, bayonets, wholesale massacres,—are among the responses they get to their pious prayers in our behalf!

Well, if crushing is in the womb of time for us, let it come. We are ready to a man to die, if need be, for our convictions. But let our persecutors not imagine that Mormonism would suffer. Individually we should merely transfer our efforts for mankind to the Church of the First Born in the spirit world—for this life is not the only sphere where the work of salvation is being carried on—and the very ranks of our enemies might be trusted for recruits to take our places here.

However, before they start this new crusade for the glory of God(!), let me commend to them the advice of one Gamaliel, a wise man in his day: "Refrain from these men and let them alone: for if this counsel, or this work, be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it,—lest haply ye be found even to fight against God."

THE DICTIONARY OF SLANDER.

It would be impossible, in the brief space at my command, to set down even a naked catalogue of the slanders that have been invented against the Mormons; only those will be noticed, therefore, which are pivotal and far-reaching. Why these moral fungi —these plants of the night—should be so prolific in an age of enlightenment and tolerance, is explicable only on the theory of atavism—the recurrence of moral diseases to which our ancestors were subject when darkness and hatred ruled the world. Why the poison of them should be directed against Mormonism, is best explained perhaps on the theory that men have ceased to believe actively in the existence of the devil, and so have been compelled to hit upon some substitute, out of sheer need to give air to a smothering sense of damnation within them.

Nor is this unburdening of evil confined to the ignorant and vulgar. It breaks out 'neath the garb of culture, refinement, and benevolence. Given a situation in which a man's veracity will not be questioned, no matter what he says, and what mere mortal will resist the temptation to ease himself of a generic virus of hate subconsciously active in him? Even angels in human guise often find relief from the pressure of their holiness, by stopping occasionally between their devotions to sprout a falsehood or two against the Mormons. Indeed,—

> "Some books are lies frae end to end,
> And some great lies hae ne'er been penned
> E'en ministers, they hae been kenned,
> Wi' holy rapture—
> At times a rousin' whid to vend,
> And nail't wi' scripture."

Nor is it difficult to understand why these same books have such a tremendous vogue; especially in the light of the scriptural explanation that "he who maketh also loveth a lie." The man or woman whose ancestral devilishness remains unsatisfied from lack of brilliancy in themselves to invent a slander, will generally be looking for a compilation of the inventions of others; for be the craving active or passive, it gives a sense of deep satisfaction to nine men out of ten to feel that there are beings living whom it is fashionable heartily to vilify. The Mormons are carrying now only a fraction of what the devil was gratuitously loaded with three quarters of a century ago.

THE MATRIX OF HATE.

Before me lies a volume admirably described in the lines above-quoted; and yet it is quite unlike the widely circulated crop of its predecessors. These sensational "Exposures" always made an appeal, more or less, to maudlin sentimentality; picturing the Mormons in colors quite lurid enough to satisfy the atavistic desires for the old time Presbyterian sermon concerning hell and its inhabitants. This, on the contrary, assumes the judicial tone. "No chapter in American history," says the preface," has remained so long unwritten as that which tells the story of the Mormons. * * * The object of the present work is to present a consecutive history from the day of their origin to the present writing, and as a secular, not as a religious, narrative. The search has been for facts, not for moral deductions, except as these present themselves in the course of the story."

Such is the way in which the author* seeks to inspire confidence in the reader. Never was fair promise more completely belied by foul performance. He has not proceeded ten pages until you are aware of the

*William Alexander Linn, "The Story of the Mormons."

settled conviction guiding his pen; viz., that Mormonism is the most collossal fraud of modern times, and that consequently the facts he is looking for are those only which will sustain this hypothesis. You know on the start that let the truth be what it may, he is going to steer this hypothesis through; if in the direction of facts, well and good; if not, then in the teeth of facts,—yet still by a cunning manipulation of facts.

"The cynic," says Beecher, "is one who never sees a good quality in a man, and never fails to see a bad one. He is the human owl; vigilant in darkness, but blind to light; mousing for vermin, but never seeing noble game." If Mr. Linn ever saw a good quality in a Mormon or in Mormonism, he does not betray the fact by a single line, nor by a single epithet. Not once does he relent toward the charitable view of a transaction. From preface to index the sustaining motive is hate—a hard, dull, bitterness of hate, which, for six hundred octavo pages, does not once thaw out—not even on the southern slope of facts. And this, too, while apparently the sun of fairness is shining! Surely we have here the very genius of cynicism.

What his method is,—the cunning of it

all,—we shall have occasion to know as this dictionary of slander proceeds. Here it is pertinent to remark that never was tangle-foot paper gummed to catch flies with half the artful ingenuity that this matrix of hate is made to attract and embalm the winged falsehoods against Mormonism. They are all here,—old lies, decrepit lies, lurid lies, smutty lies, transparent lies, all are here,—newly dressed and respectable-looking; not in haphazard order either, but marshalled according to their devilish rank. Surely there must be rejoicing in the nether regions that creations such as these are enjoying just now an ephemeral reign of respectability.

THE SMITH FAMILY.

Of course Mr. Linn, like all other traducers of Mormonism, has conceived it necessary to prepare a background for the picture of Mormonism that he is getting ready to paint. All vestiges of honorable character must be taken from its founders. In following him I shall, however, omit the insidious preparation of suggestion and inuendo whereby he gets his readers ready to swallow the slanders against the Smith family; I shall give at once the passages he relies upon to blacken their character.

"At this period in the life and career of Joseph Smith, Jr., or Joe Smith, as he was universally named, and the Smith family, they were popularly regarded as an illiterate, whiskey-drinking, shiftless, irreligious race of people—the first named, the chief subject of this biography, being unanimously voted the laziest and most worthless of the generation. From the age of twelve to twenty years he is distinctly remembered as a dull-eyed, flaxen-haired, prevaricating boy—noted only for his indolent and vagabondish character, and his habits of exaggeration and untruthfulness."

This is the opinion of one Pomeroy Tucker, a rabid anti-Mormon, who wrote an "exposure" entitled "Origin, Rise, and Progress of Mormonism." Incidentally it is an illustration of how Mr. Linn's "Search was for facts(!) not for moral deductions." Then he quotes the following affidavit signed by eleven of the most prominent(!) citizens of Manchester, New York:

"We, the undersigned, being personally acquainted with the family of Joseph Smith, Sr., with whom the Gold Bible, so called, originated, state: That they were not only a lazy, indolent set of men, but also intemperate, and their word was not to be depended upon; and that we are truly glad to dispense with their society."

This was collected by D. P. Hurlbut, alias Howe, who wrote another "exposure" called "Mormonism Unveiled." Mr. Linn pro-

ceeds to quote two other affidavits from the same veracious(!) source; one of which betrays the cloven hoof by closing so: "Joseph Smith Sr., and Joseph Smith Jr., were *in particular,* considered entirely destitute of moral character, and addicted to vicious habits." Of course; the origin of Mormonism had most to do with these two. It was sufficient to spatter the rest of the family with mud,—these two must be covered from head to foot! How cheap and vulgar do Mr. Linn's "facts" become, when not preceded by Mr. Linn's rhetoric!

These slanders are so palpably malicious that they refute themselves. As to the charge of indolence and laziness, Mr. Linn himself unwittingly furnishes the refutation. On page 11, he says—quite as if the facts were damaging: "There [at Palmyra] the father displayed a sign 'Cake and Beer Shop,' selling gingerbread, pies, boiled eggs, root beer, and other like notions, and he and his sons did odd jobs, gardening, harvesting, and well digging, when they could get them. They were very poor and Mrs. Smith added to their income by painting oil-cloth table covers. * * * They sold cord-wood, vegetables, brooms of their own manufacture, and maple sugar." Be-

sides which he mentions that they were farming a piece of land two miles south of the village on which they had built themselves "a little log house with two rooms on the ground floor and two in the attic which sheltered them all."

Let the reader carefully examine this catalogue of things. Does it not look as if every one did something towards the maintenance of the family, and were busy, moreover, both in season and out? It is strong evidence of thrift rather than of indolence. They were poor of course; but since when has it been a crime to be poor?

As to intemprance and dishonesty, these vices do not go along with thrift and industry. Such charges are purely the mouthings of hate. Joseph Smith had dared to say that the Gospel of Jesus Christ was restored through him in all its purity. That fact itself condemned their religions as man-made. We need go no further to account for the hatred and bigotry, which sought a cowardly revenge in slander. "The cry of 'False prophet! False prophet!' was sounded from village to village," said Mr. Reid, referring to the first mobbing of Joseph Smith, a few days after the organization of the Church in 1830; "and every foul

epithet that malice could invent was heaped upon him."*

The culmination of this mob spirit was a trial in South Bainbridge which attracted the attention of the whole of Chenango County. Here these enemies of the youthful Prophet concentrated the venom of their hatred in a vain endeavor to fix some charge of evil upon him. "Not one blemish or spot was found against his character," continues Mr. Reid. "He came from that trial, notwithstanding the mighty efforts that were made to convict him of crime by his vigilant persecutors, with his character unstained by even the appearance of guilt."

Nevertheless, the moment he was acquitted he was re-arrested and taken to Colesville, Broome County, where the miserable farce was repeated with similar results. Here is an example of the nature of those prosecutions:

"Did not the prisoner Joseph Smith, have a horse of you?"—"Yes," said the witness, Mr. Josiah Stoal.—"Did not he go to you and tell you that an angel had appeared unto him and authorized him to get the horse from you?"

*Roberts' History of the Church, p. 95. Mr. Reid was not a member of the Church, but a gentleman who was present and witnessed the things of which he spoke.

"No, he told me no such story."—"Well, how had he the horse of you?"—"He bought him of me as any other man would."—"Have you had your pay?"—"That is not your business."—The question being put again, the witness replied: "I hold his note for the price of the horse, which I consider as good as the pay; for I am well acquainted with Joseph Smith, Jr., and know him to be an honest man; and if he wishes, I am ready to let him have another horse on the same terms."—Mr. Jonathan Thompson was next called up and examined: "Has not the prisoner, Joseph Smith, Jr., had a yoke of oxen of you?"—"Yes."—"Did he not obtain them of you by telling you that he had a revelation to the effect that he was to have them?"—"No, he did not mention a word of the kind concerning the oxen; he purchased them the same as any other man would."

Is it likely that people twice baffled in attempting to fix odium upon the Prophet's character in a court of justice, would hesitate to furnish such biased garbage-hunters as Tucker and Hurlbut above-quoted with anything—anything—they might wish, to make their "exposures" telling?

The absolute disproof of these charges is found in the after life of these men. "The preposterousness," sneers Mr. Linn, "of the claims of such a fellow as Smith to prophetic powers and divinely revealed information were so apparent to his local acquaintances that they gave him little attention." To

which it may be replied that his most intimate acquaintances—those from whom it would have been impossible to hide a fraud—his father and mother, his nine brothers and sisters, and many of his immediate neighbors, did so accept him. Explain this if you can, on any other theory than the conviction of absolute sincerity; and try to make the fact square with the charges of dishonesty, laziness, intemperance!

Then follow the life of the Prophet's father during the next ten years; see him a humble missionary traveling thousands of miles afoot without purse or scrip; suffering imprisonment; fleeing from mobs in the dead of winter; growing ever more venerable and beloved, until thousands came to ask a blessing at his hands; dying finally in the absolute conviction that the new dispensation of the Gospel revealed by his son, was from God;—read all this, and see if you can believe the foul words with which Mr. Linn would besmirch his character!

"The exposure he suffered brought on consumption, of which he died September 14, 1840, aged 69 years, two months, and two days. He was six feet two inches high, was very straight, and remarkably well proportioned. His ordinary weight was about two hundred pounds, and he was very strong and active. In his young

days he was famed as a wrestler, and, Jacob-like, he never wrestled with but one man whom he could not throw. He was one of the most benevolent of men, opening his house to all who were destitute. While at Quincy, Illinois, he fed hundreds of the poor Saints who were flying from the Missouri persecutions, although he had arrived there penniless himself."

And this was the man whom Mr. Linn consents to class among an "illiterate, whiskey-drinking, shiftless, irreligious race of people!" And since he especially singles out the one son Joseph for reprobation with the father, as a "dull-eyed, flaxen-haired, prevaricating boy—noted only for his indolent and vagabondish character—" let me set before the reader another picture, for the truth of which his whole life after he became a marked man, is the voucher. It is from the pen of George Q. Cannon:

"In the days of Joseph, to appear like a Prophet a man should, according to the popular idea, wear a long beard, long hair, and dress in an outlandish style. If he did not wash himself and clean and pare his nails, it would be all the better. He should not smile and be merry. When he spoke, his voice should be deep and solemn; when he walked, his tread should be slow and measured. If he lived in a cave, it would suit many people better than if he lived in a house. He should be different from other men in every respect.

Of course those who had these ideas of

what a Prophet should be, were much disappointed in Joseph; for if a Prophet should talk, dress, and act in this manner, he was very unlike one. He wore no beard, did not have long hair, and was very cleanly in his person; he dressed with taste, had a pleasant face, a sweet smile, a cheerful and joyous manner, and was natural. He was the very opposite of what a religious bigot would think a Prophet ought to be; and he never took any pains to be otherwise.

He was a great hater of sham. He disliked long-faced hypocrisy, and numerous stories are told of his peculiar manner of rebuking it. He knew that what many people called sin is not sin, and he did many things to break down superstition. He would wrestle, play ball, and enjoy himself in physical exercises, and he knew that he was not committing sin in so doing. The religion of heaven is not to make men sorrowful, not to curtail their enjoyment, and to make them groan, and sigh, and wear long faces, but to make them happy. This Joseph desired to teach the people; but in doing so, he, like our Savior, when he was on the earth, was a stumbling-block to bigots and hypocrites. They could not understand him; he shocked their prejudices and traditions."

JOSEPH SMITH A MONEY DIGGER.

The purpose of reviving this old slander is ostensibly two-fold: to support the previous characterization of the Prophet, and at the same time prepare a back-ground to discredit his explanation of the coming forth of the Book of Mormon. Mr. Linn starts out

by asserting that "the elder Smith was a money-digger while in Vermont"* and proceeds to build up a plausible story—from matter in the afore-mentioned "exposures" by Howe and Tucker—to the effect that "Joe" Smith became widely famed as a "gazer" into a stone and was often employed by people whom he duped by his pretensions. Finally Mr. Linn believes the reader sufficiently prepared for this whopper:

"For pay they offered to disclose by means of it the location of stolen property and of buried money. There seemed to be no limit to the exaggration of their professions. They would point out the precise spot beneath which lay kegs, barrels and even hogsheads of gold and silver in the shape of coin, bars, images, candlesticks, etc., and they even asserted that all the hills thereabout were the work of human hands, and that Joe, by using his "peek-stone," could see the caverns beneath them. * * * A Palmyra man, for instance, paid seventy-five cents to be sent on a fool's errand to look for some stolen cloth."

*This on the gratuitous assertion of "Judge" Daniel Woodward sixty years afterwards, who said that Smith hunted for Capt. Kidd's treasure. As a hundred thousand people have hunted for this buried scat, the invention lacks originality; and as the Smiths lived some hundreds of miles from the nearest point Capt. Kidd probably ever touched, the slander is stupid and senseless, as well. It is safe to float such stories only against a Mormon—and the devil."

The juxta-position of the two assertions that Smith claimed to be able to see "kegs and barrels of gold and silver" and that other of his accepting seventy-five cents to spy out a piece of stolen cloth, is staggering. How Mr. Linn could so presume upon the absence of common sense in his readers, is explicable only when we remember the momentum of hate which carried him on. Does he really expect any sane man to believe this story? Or even this choice bit of romance, which immediately follows:—

"Certain ceremonies were always connected with these money-digging operations. Midnight was the favorite hour, a full moon was helpful, and Good Friday was the best date. Joe would sometimes stand by, directing the digging with a wand. The utmost silence was necessary to success. More than once, when the digging proved a failure, Joe explained to his associates that, just as the deposit was about to be reached, some one, tempted by the devil, spoke, causing the wished-for riches to disappear."

What then is the probable fact of the matter? That Joseph may have been caught intermittently by the prospecting fever, in common with hundreds of others, is possible—especially when one remembers how that craze sometimes attacks whole towns in the west; but that he made a business of

it, is disproved no less by the record of other work that claimed him during the years prior to 1827, than by the fact that not once is he accused, even by his vilest traducers, of treasure-hunting since then. We must therefore believe that his detractors deliberately loaded on his memory the sins—both as respects fact and invention—of a whole community. Here is the Prophet's own explanation; I am willing to trust the reader's intuition as to its truth:

"In the month of October, 1825, I hired with an old gentleman by the name of Josiah Stoal, who lived in Chenango County, State of New York. He had heard something of a silver mine having been opened by the Spaniards in Harmony, Susquehanna County, State of Pennsylvania, and had previous to my hiring with him, been digging in order, if possible, to discover the mine. After I went to live with him he took me, among the rest of his hands, to dig for the silver mine, at which I continued to work for nearly a month, without success in our undertaking, and finally I prevailed with the old gentleman to cease digging for it. Hence arose the very prevalent story of my having been a money-digger."

THE SPAULDING STORY REVIVED.

It will be incredible to most of my readers that Mr. Linn has had the temerity to reassert that old and utterly discredited hypothesis of the origin of the Book of Mor-

mon. Such is nevertheless the case. However, before setting forth how he tries to revamp the old Hurlbut shoe, I shall give, in brief, the history of Spaulding's manuscript.

Solomon Spaulding, a disgruntled clergyman of Conneaut, Ohio, witnessing the excavation of some old mounds, conceived the idea of telling the story of Ancient America, and called his production, "The Manuscript Found." He tried various publishers in vain; for his story, as we shall see presently, was as raw and crude as a school-boy's composition. Spaulding died in 1816. His wife married a Mr. Davidson in 1820, and Mr. Spaulding's effects were sent to her at Otsego, New York. "These included an old trunk," says Mr. Linn, "containing Mr. Spaulding's papers. 'There were sermons and other papers,' says his daughter, 'and I saw a manuscript about an inch thick, closely written. * * * On the outside * * were the words. "Manuscript Found." I did not read it, but looked through it, and had it in my hands many times, and saw the names I heard at Conneaut, when my father read it to his friends.'"

This manuscript reached the printing establishment of E. D. Howe (pseudo-author

of "Mormonism Unveiled" previously quoted), at Painesville, Ohio, through the medium of D. P. Hurlbut (the real author of "Mormonism Unveiled), an apostate Mormon, in the following manner: Hating the religion from which he had apostatized—as all apostates do—and hearing that Spaulding had written a story, respecting ancient America, he set afloat the fabrication that the Book of Mormon was a plagiarism of this story. To prove this he applied to Mrs. Davidson for permission to read her former husband's manuscript, evidently with a view to getting an incontrovertible argument denouncing Mormonism. As the request was seconded by a letter from her brother, she consented on condition that it be returned to her by a certain date. This was in 1834—four years after the Book of Mormon appeared. But the manuscript was never returned. What had become of it?

Howe's—that is to say Hurlbut's—book in the meanwhile had been published (in 1836) charging definitely that the Book of Mormon was founded on the lost manuscript, and all the world was glad to believe the absurd invention.

In 1880—forty-six years later—Mrs. Ellen E. Dickenson a great niece of Spaulding.

called on Hurlbut at his home near Gibsonburg, Ohio. "Her visit," says Linn, "greatly excited him." He remembered getting the manuscript, and of delivering it to Mr. Howe, but thought it had been burned with other of Mr. Howe's papers. Mr. Linn continues (p. 56):

> "When Mrs. Dickenson pressed him with the question, 'Do you know where the "Manuscript Found" is at the present time?' Mrs. Hurlbut went up to him and said, 'Tell what you know.' She got no satisfactory answer, but he afterwards forwarded to her an affidavit saying that he had obtained of Mrs. Davidson a manuscript supposing it to be Spaulding's 'Manuscript Found,' adding: 'I did not examine the manuscript until after I got home, when upon examination I found it to contain nothing of the kind, but being a manuscript upon an entirely different subject. This manuscript I left with E. D. Howe.'"

I am going to quote from this manuscript presently—just to show the reader what kind of stuff Spaulding's story is made of, and how disappointed the Apostate Hurlbut must have been. "Why if it had been the real one" so he is quoted by Mr. Linn as saying, "I could have sold it for $3,000; but I just gave it to Howe because it was no account."

Hurlbut (alias Howe) made it of some account, however. It is characteristic of the utter shamelessness of the man that he based his charge of plagiarism upon it, even while

knowing that no two names or phrases in the respective books were alike. Nor did he lie thus brazenly alone. He secured the affidavits of eight of Spaulding's acquaintances in Ohio, all declaring that the historical parts of the two books were identical, as they recollected Spaulding's story. Henry N. Miller is quoted as saying:

> "I have recently examined the 'Book of Mormon,' and find in it the writings of Solomon Spaulding, from beginning to end, but mixed up with Scripture and other religious matter which I did not meet with in the 'Manuscript Found.' The names of Nephi, Lehi, Moroni, and in fact all the principal names, are brought fresh to my recollection by the 'Gold Bible.'"

The Rev. Abner Judson, who claims to have heard the Spaulding story read to his father, says:

> "He wrote it in the Bible style. 'And it came to pass,' occurred so often that some called him 'Old Come-to-pass.' The 'Book of Mormon' follows the romance too closely to be a stranger. When it was brought to Conneaut and read there in public, old Esquire Wright heard it and exclaimed, "Old 'Come-to-pass' has come to light again.'"

Particular attention is called to the alleged utterances of Miller and Wright as here quoted by Howe and copied by Linn. We shall see presently how much reliance can be placed upon facts gathered by an apostate. Unfortunately for these veracious(!) historians, the long-lost manuscript was found, and is now in the Oberlin

College library. The President, Mr. Fairchild, being on a visit to his old friend, Mr. L. L. Rice of the Sandwich Islands, and remembering that the latter had purchased E. D. Howe's printing establishment, suggested that there might be, among the old papers, some valuable anti-slavery documents. Their search resulted in finding Spaulding's much-famed story. It was tied up in a package marked in pencil: "Manuscript Story, Conneaut Creek," and on the fly-leaf, "The Manuscript Found," below which were the words "Manuscript Story."

The introduction informs the reader that the story was translated from "twenty-eight sheets of parchment * * * written in an eligant hand with Roman Letters and and in the Latin Language," taken from a stone box in a cave "near the west bank of Conneaught River," Ohio. The writer is feigned to be one Fabius who sets sail from Rome to carry a commission from Constantine to the Roman army in "Brittain." Driven by a storm into mid-Atlantic, the crew is almost frantic with fear, when "a mariner stept forward and proclaimed, Attend O friends and listen to my words—A voice from on high hath penetrated my soul and the inspiration of the Almighty hath bid me

proclaim—Let your sails be wide spread and the gentle winds will soon waft you into a gentle harbor."

On the fifth day they sailed "many leages" up a "spacious river" and cast anchor near a town. Here they were met by a king and four chiefs, were feasted, then surrounded by a ring of one thousand men and women, and treated to a melange of "shouting and screaming, whooping—then dancing, jumping and tumbling with many indiscribible distortions in their countenances and indelicate jestures," and finally given a tract of land to build upon.

"But now a most singular and delicate subject presented itself for consideration. Seven young ladies we had on board, as passengers, to visit certain friends they had in Britain—Three of them were ladies of rank, and the rest were healthy bucksom Lasses.—Whilst deliberating on this subject a mariner arose whom we called droll Tom—Hark ye shipmates says he, Whilst tossed on the foaming billows what brave son of neptune had any more regard for a woman than a sturgeon, but now we are all safely anchored on Terra firma—our salls furled and ship keeled up, I have a huge longing for some of those rosy dames—But willing to take my chance with my shipmates—I propose that they should make their choice of husbands."

"Droll Tom"was rewarded "by one of the most sprightly rosy dames in the company * * * The three young ladies [of rank] fixed their choise on the Captain the mate and myself. * * * The six poor fellows

who were doomed to live in a state of Cebicy or accept of savage dames, discovered a little chagrine and anxiety." The event, however is duly celebrated and—

"After having partook of an eligant Dinner & drank a botle of excellent wine our spirits were exhilerated & the deep gloom which beclouded our minds evaporated. The Capt. assuming his wonted cheerfuiness made the following address My sweet good soald fellows we have now commenced a new voige—Not such as brot us over mountain billows to this butt end of the world. * * * * Surrounded by innumerable hords of human beings, who resemble in manners the Ourang Outang—let us keep aloof from them & not embark in the same matrimonial ship."

"Honest Crito"—one of the six—does not get such lofty ideas out of the wine. "Methinks," said he,—and he evidently speaks for his ill-starred mates— "I could pick out a healthy plum Lass from the copper coulered tribe that by washing and scrubing her fore and aft and upon the labbord and stabbord sides she would become a wholesome bedfellow." The seven happy couples are too magnanimous to oppose so natural a wish, and tell Crito to try the experiment. Night closes down finally. "We retired" says Fabius, "two and two in hand—ladies heads a little awri-blushing like the moon and—But I forgot to mention that our society passed a resolution to build a church in the midst of our village."

Chapter three is devoted to an account of the "Delawans" with whom the new-comers lived; chapter four to a philosophical dissertation on the form of the earth; also to an account of their moving westward to the kingdom of the "Ohons," the women and children being transported on the backs of six "Mammoons;" chapters five, six, seven, and eight, to prosy details respecting the "Ohons," "Kentucks," "Sciotans," and other nations; chapters nine and ten to an account of learning, government, money, religion and kindred topics, which, were they real facts, might excite interest on account of their very crudity, but which, as fiction, are insufferably boring. A ray of relief comes, when the book is half done, in the fact that Elseon, eldest son of "Hamboon, Emperor of Kentuck," makes love to Lamesa, eldest daughter of "Rambock, Emperor of Sciota." The constitution of Sciota prohibits such a marriage. But trust love to find a way. Listen to this:

"They were together in one of apartments of the Emperors palace—the company had all retired.—I have said he in a low voice to Lamesa—conceived that opinion of you that I hope you will not be displeased if I express my feelings with frankness & sincerity.—You must, she replied be the best judge of what is proper for you to express—I am always pleased with sincerity. As the sun, says he my dear Lamesa,

when he rises with his radient beams dispels the darkness of knight, so it is in your power to dispel the clouds of anxiety which rest upon my soul—The crown of Kentuck will be like a Rock upon my head, unless you will condescend to share with me the glory & felicity of my reign. Will you consent to be my dearest friend & companion for life? There is nothing she replies would give me more pleasure than a compliance with your request, provided it shall meet the approbation of my Father—But how can he consent, when our Constitution requires that his daughters should marry in his dominions? Besides my father intends that I shall receive the King of Sciota for my husband. By performing says he, the cerimonies of Mariage at Tolanga we shall literally comply with the imperial constitution, as Talanga is within the dominions of your Father—But as for this King of Sciota do you sincerely wish to have him for a husband? No, she quickly speaks, anger sparkled in her eyes—No! The King of Sciota for my husband! his pride, his haughtiness—the pomposity of all his movements, excite my perfect disgust. I should as leave be yoked to a porcupine."

It ought here to be remarked that the only condition on which President Fairchild would consent to the publication of this famous story was that no change whatever be made in the manuscript; to which end he furnished the Latter-day Saints with a *verbatim et literatim* copy, passages of which I herewith reprint to show its utter unlikeness to the Book of Mormon. The excerpt above quoted exhibits Mr. Spaulding perhaps at his best as an author; unless the fragment which follows is more characteristic. Lamesa has received a letter signed

& beholding his defenceless situation, he ran a small distance, & seizing a stone sufficiently big for a common man to lift he threw it at Elseon—It flew with great velocity & had not Elseon bowed his head his brains must have quited their habitation—his Cap however was not so fortunate; having met the stone as he bowed it was carried some distance from him & lodged on the ground. Elseon regardless of his cap, ran swiftly upon Sambal, whose feet having slipped when he threw the stone had fallen upon his back & had not recovered—Terror now seized his mind—Spare, O spare my life says he & I will restore peace to Kentuck & you may enjoy Lamesa.—No peace sais Elseon do I desire with a man, whose sword is red with the blood of my friends. He spoke & plunged his sword into Sambals heart."

Whatever may be said of Mr. Spaulding's spelling, diction, and sentential structure, his invention is even worse. His plot—if plot it may be called— lacks prospectiveness. Not once does he excite suspense as to the outcome of any situation. Indeed, his characters are so wooden that the reader can feel no interest in them whatever. Here, for instance, is the last meeting of the hero and heroine—poor saw dust figures that they are!

"The time of Elseon was precious—He spent but a few moments with Lamesa, in which they exchanged mutual congratulations—& expressions of the most tender & sincere affection.—She conjured him to spare the life of her father & brother & not to expose his own life any farther than his honour & the interst of his country required. I shall cheerfully says he comply with every request, which will promote your happiness. He embraced her & bid her adue."—

"Rambock, Em. of Sciota," commanding her to marry Sambal in ten days. The immediate results are dramatic:

"Had the lightning flashed from the clouds & pierced her heart, it could not have produced a more instantaneous effect—She fell into the arms of Elseon—the maid ran for a cordial—Elseon rubed her temples & hands & loosned the girdle about her waist. Within about an hour the blood began to circulate. Elseon to his inexpressible joy felt her pulse beginning to beat & perceived flashes of colour in her face—With a plaintive groan she opened her eyes once more to the beams of day—& in a kind of wild destraction exclaimed—Ah cruel cruel Father—why have you doomed your daughter to a situation the most odious & disgustful—As well might you have thrown her into a den of porcupines, opossums & serpents—With such anmals I could enjoy life with less disgust & torment, than with this mighty King of Sciota."

Of course Elseon escapes to his own country, taking Lamesa with him. A war follows—the first in five hundred years. Before events begin to stir, however, the reader must yawn through endless letters between the emperors containing threats and counter threats, and through tiresome spread-eagle speeches concerning honor and patriotism. Here is the turning point in the war:

"Sambal was now more indignant than ever—& raising his sword he threw his whole strength into one mighty effort, with an intention to divide his body in twain. But Elseon, quick as the Lightning sprang back & Sambals sword struck the ground with a prodigious force which broke in the middle—He himself had nearly tumbled his whole length—but recovering

Two more paragraphs close the story; after which is the following notation: "The end of Solomon's Manuscript, copied by L. L. Rice, 1884 and 1885." Next comes an endorsement which must forever damn the author of "Mormonism Unveiled." It reads as follows:—

"The writings of Sollomon Spalding proved by Oron Wright Oliver Smith John Miller and others The testimonies of the above Gentlemen are now in my possession D. P. Hurlbut."

The reader will call to mind that Hurlbut (alias Howe) prints affidavits, so Linn declares, representing two of these men, John Miller and Aaron Wright, as saying that they immediately recognized Spaulding's story in the Book of Mormon by the similarity of names, and the recurrence of the phrase "It came to pass." Wright is represented as exclaiming: "Old 'come to pass,' has come to life again!" Yet here is Hurlbut's certificate of the fact that these men were acquainted with the real manuscript, in which none of those expressions occur at all; which in fact is no more like the Book of Mormon than the coarse yarns of a horse-jockey resemble the Sermon on the Mount. Still these are the facts(!) on which Mr. Linn expects to make out his case.

(*To be continued.*)

THE MORMON POINT OF VIEW.

A Quarterly Magazine, owned and edited by N. L. Nelson, Professor of English, Brigham Young University. Price, $1.00 a year; single copies, 30c. Entered in the Postoffice at Provo City, Utah, as second-class matter.

Vol. I. Provo City, Utah, April 1, 1904. No. 2.

RECEPTION OF THE NEW MAGAZINE.

With almost every remittance come the encouraging words: Long life to the new magazine! "I commend your courage," writes Prof. B. S. Hinckley. "Accept my sincere wishes for the complete success of your great enterprise." From the headquarters of the Southern States mission: "We have taken great delight in perusing the initial number, just received, and recognize in your effort, that which will, we are confident, fill a long felt want."

Naturally many of the encouraging letters come from missionaries. "I believe it will be of great benefit in helping me to place the Gospel before the higher class of people," writes an Elder in California. Another encloses to me a dollar just received from a chum at home, with the remark that he could think of no other way of spending it

our own development where we must study the philosophy underlying the principles of the Gospel, *and learn what these principles are,—how they appeal to our lives and how they affect the lives of others,—rather than continue proving that Peter, James, John, and Paul taught them.* Christ commanded His Apostles to 'teach' all nations the things that He had taught *them.* The same injunction is laid on us. We sometimes think we have discharged that duty when we prove that the former Apostles taught faith, repentance, baptism, etc.; but these terms have very little meaning to most people. They want to know *why* they should act, before they move, and what the result will be.

"This spirit is manifest not only in the world, but also among our own young people. They too are asking why; and the Gospel is such a beautiful, such a perfect philosophy of life, that I have wondered why some of our literary artists have not tried their brush on it long ago. I have felt the need of something of the kind so much in our missionary classes, and in my efforts to explain the many questions asked by the Elders, that I have been trying to write some essays myself, during the past year, on the Fall, the Atonement and other principles of the Gospel. I am not a professor of language and often find it impossible to illustrate by the arrangement of words the pic-

that it would do himself and the cause so much good. "Your recent article in the Era on 'Two aspects of Deity' gave me an appetite for more. . . . This state is full of the Thomas type of individuals, with scarcely any of the Nathaniel class."

But many friends write me of the good they think such a journal will do in Zion. "I am myself one of the simple Nathaniels," writes a sister from Parowan, "but I have many dear ones who are not of that class, but who belong to the doubters; and I am sure your magazine is just what I am looking for." From a brother in Chester comes this endorsement: "I wish there were 'ten thousand pens' as able as yours advocating these same principles in as thorough a manner." And dear, blunt Brother Savage reminds me: "You have a big job on your hands to reconvert the converted saints; but I wish you God-speed in an effort to make us think more and work harder on advanced lines."

"I appreciate your view point," writes President McQuarrie of the Eastern States mission, "and feel sure you are working along the proper lines. I have long been convinced that we have reached a point in

tures I see; but I *can* see the beauty, and feel the power in these principles and in the organization of the church.

"You have a great theme and I believe you have the power and ability to illustrate the truths you have studied so carefully from the view point of reason and utility. You will have a hard struggle financially in starting your magazine; but if you are successful in getting it fairly before the people, it will be appreciated by every thoughtful person who reads it. I haven't much to offer you, Brother Nelson; but if my faith and confidence, and what little influence I possess, will be of service to you, I take pleasure in offering you the latter, and assuring you of the former. I pray that you may be blessed in your worthy enterprise. The courage that undertakes such a task deserves success."

My readers will pardon me, I trust, for putting off again the essay on the "Mormon Point of View." As the articles in the "Dictionary of Slander" happened all to turn on matters relating to the Book of Mormon, I felt I could not forego the opportunity of making this a Book of Mormon number; especially as the leading article is germane to the present widely-aroused discussions resulting from the new ideas set forth in the M. I. Manual respecting the coming forth of this ancient record.

HUMAN SIDE OF THE BOOK OF MORMON.

I.

THE HUMAN EQUATION IN ALL SCRIPTURE.

In closing his preface to the abridgment he had made of the Nephite records, the Prophet Mormon uses these significant words: "Now if there are faults, they are the mistakes of men: wherefore condemn not the things of God that ye may be found spotless at the judgment seat of Christ." Joseph, the translator, might well have used the same language. This caution is manifestly not to assure us that God makes no mistakes—that fact is self-evident. The purpose is plainly to imply the writer's awareness that there may be errors, many of them, in this record of an ancient people. It would certainly be rash to hold that the book as translated is free from them.

This raises at once the question whether a book may be divinely inspired which is more or less full of human errors and inaccuracies. Let the reader pause well before making reply; remembering that his answer must involve the Bible equally with the

tions. How, indeed, could there be a perfect revelation flowing through the channel of an imperfect mind, and moulded in the matrix of an imperfect medium? It would be folly to look for it either in the Bible or the Book of Mormon. But God can, and does, compensate for the imperfect personal equation of the prophet by making each individual soul that seeks him in faith feel—even as the Prophet felt—the truth of the message, through the medium of the Spirit of truth. "Though the letter killeth, yet doth the Spirt make alive."

Let us now note, in the light of this thought, wherein the Book of Mormon is almost certain to contain errors and inaccuracies; first in respect of the original abridgment by Mormon, and second in respect of its translation into English by Joseph Smith.

The ancient history of America as set forth in the Book of Mormon covers a period of nearly 2,700 years, or from the building of the tower of Babel to about 400 of the Christian era. It involves an account of two separate and distinct peoples. The first, or Jaredites, became extinct about 590 B. C., or shortly after the second race, the Nephites, began to flourish; and the history of the first race became known to the second by means

Book of Mormon,—a fact that need not be insisted upon to any one acquainted with the results of the "higher criticism" of the Jewish scriptures. Space will not permit me to enter into this theme; but perhaps the following suggestions may aid in coming to a proper conclusion.

Whenever God attempts to speak to man through the medium of words he is at once conditioned and handicapped: (1) by the imperfection of man's language, which be it remembered consists of nothing more than a collection of symbols for the facts of man's consciousness—that is, for both the truths and errors that lie in his mind; and (2) by the degree of intelligence to which the mind has attained through which he speaks. The prophet's soul may no doubt be so illumined by divine power as to feel within itself the full truth of the message; but the moment he attempts to translate his feelings into words he is conditioned not only by what he knows of the meaning of these symbols (i. e. by the extent of his knowledge), but also by his skill or want of skill in the use of them.

Try as you will, you cannot bridge the gulf between God and man by any revelation in words which is not subject to these condi-

similar to that which now makes the history of both known to us; that is, plates on which was written an account of the older civilization were found by the Nephites among the ruins of the extinct race, and translated by means of Urim and Thummim.

The end of the second, or Nephite nation, being known to God, He commanded the Prophet Mormon, who lived in the latter half of the fourth century, A. D., to abridge from the tons of records in the royal archives a connected history of both peoples; the purpose being to show mankind in our day, that God lives and rules among the nations of the earth; or in the language of Mormon's preface "to the convincing of Jew and Gentile that Jesus is the Christ, the eternal God, manifesting himself to all nations."

It is not contended that Mormon was an infallible historian. On the contrary, he was a man like you and me, willing to attempt God's work by the highest light and best ability within him, and as he might be guided by the inspiration of heaven. The requirement made of him, and his qualifications for the work, may best be realized perhaps if we suppose Paul, Peter, the Beloved Apostle, or even some humble Luke in the early Church, to have been command-

ed to abridge the Jewish records, so as to make a continuous history from the point of view of God's dealings with man.

In only one thing should we expect such a book to approach infallibility; viz, in whatever might be necessary to secure its central purpose: the keeping alive of faith in God, by portraying his providences in the annals of history, or by setting forth the truths of his Gospel in holy precept. In the rounding out of this large essential truth, we may well believe that the spirit of inspiration would enlighten or restrain the historian at every step, to the end that men in reading the history might come unto God,—the supreme essential in the life of man here below.

But for the rest,—the thousand insignificant details in the life of a people; details of geography, politics, natural environments, —what matter if this date be wrong, that incident credited to this king when it belongs to another, or there be some inaccuracy as to the number of killed or wounded in a certain battle? Is the Mississippi less a river, because you fail to enumerate accurately its shoals and sand bars, or the debris floating on its surface?

Had Peter been the historian of such an

abridgment, would it be sane to discredit the divine inspiration of the book because, for instance, he repeated the story of Samson slaying a thousand Philistines with the jaw bone of an ass? Or even gave credence to that other story about the foxes and the ripened grain? The sooner Christians allow for the personal equation of the sacred writers, the sooner will the Bible become a consistent record of God's dealings with man.

And so of the Book of Mormon. The records whence it was compiled were written during a period of a thousand years, and with no doubt all the fidelity to truth of which their authors were capable; yet compared with what we know today of the natural world—of geography, topography, geology, mineralogy, botany, zoology—what should we expect under these heads even in the complete Nephite records? Less therefore in an abridgment which could represent scarcely a thousandth part of the records abridged, and which aimed primarily to select only those aspects of the history which dealt with the providences of God.

With all the learning at his command, Mormon would probably not be able to get even so accurate a geographical knowledge

of North and South America as may now be known by a pupil in the fifth grade. What wonder therefore that his locations are somewhat vague, or that he omits reference entirely to very important places? And, if he seems to shorten distances between points,—as for instance the "land southward" and the "land northward" from the "narrow neck of land,"—is it not precisely what we should expect of one reviewing the records of a thousand years of movement, and traveling himself in imagination rather than in reality?

So also in a multitude of secular details: manufacture, architecture, domestic life, natural and physical environment, agriculture, commerce, politics, jurisprudence, and so on; allusions to which must necessarily be oblique, if they occur at all, since the purpose was not to give the secular but the religious life of the nation.

II.

VERBAL SHORTCOMINGS IN THE BOOK OF MORMON.

Another fact becomes patent the moment you subject the Book of Mormon to literary analysis: the original writer was no master of style—at least not in the sense in which

we apply that term to modern composition. To be a master of style is, among other things, to know what to leave out, and how to convey thought between the lines. The Prophet Mormon seems to have written right on, without a single erasure or reconstruction. The style is consequently very diffuse, but also very simple and clear.

As to the mannerisms in the book, some are undoubtedly attributable to the original writers, others to the translator. Among the first may be mentioned the oft-recurring phrase, "It came to pass;" which is probably the best English rendering of what must have been a much-used anticipative idiom in the Nephite language. Akin to this in its purpose of arresting the attention, is the interjection "behold," which occurs much more frequently than in any text Joseph could possibly have known. Another mannerism is set forth in the following sentence: "Behold their women *did toil* and spin and *did make* all manner of cloth, of fine-twined linen, and cloth of every kind, to clothe their nakedness." There is scarcely a page in which this, the emphatic form of the past tense, does not occur a number of times: often when the regular past would very much improve the style.

Whether this last mannerism is to be credited to Mormon or to Joseph Smith is uncertain. It is a tense-form peculiar to the English among modern tongues. To claim that it is a literal translation is to assume that there was a similar idiom in the original language; which, to say the least, would involve a unique co-incidence. But on the other hand, to say that it is exclusively a modernism is to declare that Joseph Smith did not have a very fine literary taste; which was true enough of him at this stage of his career.

Respecting the prolixity of the style, the merit or the blame*—whichever point of view you take—must probably be divided between author and translator. In the repetition of the thought, and in the multiplying of details,—that is to say, in the matter of *redundancy*,—Mormon is undoubtedly responsible; but in the many instances of *circumlocution*—the placing in a round-about phrase what one well-chosen word would have expressed—the fault, if fault it be, was perhaps Joseph's, and represents the groping stage in the growing vocabulary of a student,—a stage very familiar to the teacher of composition.

*The scholar naturally prefers a sententious style, one packed with thought. But such a style—Paul's for example—is Greek to the unlearned. On the other hand a diffuse,—that is to say, a widely-amplified, phraseographic,—style, being cast in the very forms of thought habitual to the unlettered, is very easily comprehended, though it takes more time to read. Considering the kind of people to whom God intended the Book of Mormon should appeal, its style could not have been more admirably adapted to its mission.

As to other marks of the personal equation of Joseph Smith, detractors of Mormonism are not slow to point out that some two thousand or more mistakes in grammar and spelling are to be found in the first edition, which have been expunged in subsequent editions. Nor have they all been eliminated from the modern version—one does not readily understand why. Of the occasional errors remaining, the most frequent are these: the use of "them" for "those;" the interchangeable use of "you," "ye," and "thou;" the use of the plural pronouns "they," "their," "them," after a singular antecedent; the use of "had ought" for "ought," and hadn't ought" for "ought not," also of "done" for "did;" and once in a while the use of a word ending in *ing* instead of its corresponding finite verb, thus leaving the thought hanging fire, as it were.

Respecting all these verbal errors, as well as the numerous instances of faulty diction,

and diction peculiar to the region in which the Prophet passed his boyhood, the only remark is this: they are all like so many mirrors reflecting the personality of Joseph Smith, and as such are incontrovertible evidences in support of the part he played in the coming forth of the book; while, on the other hand, they no more invalidate the glorious message it contains than would a few harmless leaves pollute a pure stream. Consequently, he who scorns to drink deep of the truths flowing from God through this record, because of its homely channel, deserves to perish of soul-thirstiness.

III.

AS TO THE SO-CALLED ANACHRONISMS AND MODERN QUOTATIONS.

Regarding the so-called anachronisms of the record,—as for instance, that Laban's sword could not have been of "purest steel" because steel had not yet been invented, and that there were no horses, cows, sheep, and swine in America, till they were brought from Europe,—it is sufficient to say here that the gratuitous opinions of *savants* on these matters do not close the question. From the very nature of the facts involved, no man can do more than vouchsafe his

opinion; but as the dicta of past antiquarians are being constantly overturned by later discoveries, it will be well to suspend judgment on these disputed points respecting the Book of Mormon. But even should inaccuracies be proved in secular details of this kind, the essential mission of the book would no more be invalidated than is that of the Bible because of manifest discrepancies in the cosmogony of Genesis.

We come now to a very interesting peculiarity in the contents of this ancient record; viz, the fact that many quotations are identical with passages in the King James' version of the Bible; passages which it is hardly likely were known by Mormon or Moroni previous to writing this record. Twenty chapters are thus incorporated bodily, or with but slight changes, from the Old Testament, and three, containing the Sermon on the mount, are taken from the New Testament.

"Besides these," says Linn, "Hyde counted 298 direct quotations from the New Testament, verses or sentences, between pages 2 to 480 covering the years from 600 B. C. to Christ's birth. Thus Nephi relates that his father, more than 2,000 years before the King James' edition of the Bible was translated, in announcing the coming of John the Baptist, used these words, "Yea, even he should go forth and cry in the wilder-

ness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, and make his paths straight; for there standeth one among you whom ye know not; and he is mightier than I, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose."

These passages when examined prove not to be "direct quotations" but rather indirect. Thoughts couched in New Testament phraseology, made up of bits from various texts,—as if the translator needed to rely upon memorized phrases to move from point to point,—are not infrequent. The quotation above noted, for instance, is made up of two; viz. Mark 1, verse 3, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight;" and verse 7, "There cometh one mightier than I, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down to unloose." But these same passages occur with slight variations respectively in Isaiah 5:27, and 40:3, which book was known to the Nephites.

However, it is not my purpose to evade the idea that Joseph Smith's translation was affected by the King James' version of the Bible, for it probably was. This passage from Moroni 7:45 is too nearly like Paul's words in Corinthians 13, to be a mere coincidence:

"And charity suffereth long, and is kind,

take no advantage of your weakness. And if men come unto me, I will show unto them their weakness. I give unto men weakness that they may be humble; and my grace is sufficient for all men that humble themselves before me; for if they humble themselves before me, and have faith in me, then will I make weak things become strong unto them. Behold, I will show unto the Gentiles their weakness, and I will show unto them that faith, hope, and charity bringeth unto me—the fountain of all righteousness."

And so confident did Moroni become that God would vindicate his work, and the work of his father—full of weaknesses though they were,—that he set down this promise on the last chapter of the record:

"Behold I would exhort you, when ye shall read these things, if it be wisdom in God that ye shall read them . . . . that ye would ask God, the eternal Father, in the name of Christ, if these things are not true; and if ye shall ask with a sincere heart, with real intent, having faith in Christ, he will manifest the truth of it unto you, by the power of the Holy Ghost."

Rather a reckless promise for an imposter to make, was it not? And yet the Lord has confirmed it to thousands and is confirming it every day. Herein, then, lies the source of Latterday Saint faith in the Book of Mormon, and not primarily in either the internal or the external evidences of its divine authenticity. Not that they are unmindful of debatable assurances. They must perforce

and envieth not, and is not puffed up, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, and rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things."

We come, then, face to face with the question, of how the Book of Mormon,—part of it written 600 years before Christ, the rest of it 400 years after, and in a place completely isolated, so far as we know, from the eastern world,—could nevertheless be influenced by the writings of the New Testament,—and the King James' version at that,—to the extent of both direct and indirect quotations.

IV.

HOW LATTERDAY SAINTS KNOW THE BOOK OF MORMON IS FROM GOD.

Before taking up the question with which the last chapter closed, however, I desire to define the attitude of ninety-nine out of every hundred Latterday Saints on the divine authenticity of this revelation. The Prophet Moroni, the last writer in the book, foreseeing the skepticism of the Gentiles in our day because of imperfections in the record, besought the Lord in much solicitude, and received this answer to his prayer:

"Fools mock, but they shall mourn; and my grace is sufficient for the meek, that they shall

believe the testimony of the witnesses—fourteen in all— who beheld the plates; they cannot doubt that Joseph Smith dictated and that Oliver Cowdery wrote the translation; the text itself is proof that Joseph could not, unaided by divine power, have invented the book; and though the difficulti- of believing it a divine record are made to seem great and numerous, the difficulties of not believing it are greater and more numerous still.

Nevertheless, while this overbalance of probabilities begets credence, it is, as observed above, the testimony of the Spirit which begets conviction. That conviction recedes to credence and credence changes to disbelief, if men apostatize, is no evidence against the divine authenticity of the book; any more than it would be proof that the sun has ceased to shine, if men go into a cave, where they can no longer see it. Nor is it essential to the purposes of God that men should believe in the Book of Mormon, who would not become, or who have ceased to be, workers in the kingdom of God; for it is an inexorable law of progress that no man can long hold fast to a truth, who evades the responsibility of living it.

Latter-day Saints, then, are convinced that

the Book of Mormon is a divinely inspired book by the same testimony that tells them God lives, that Jesus is the Christ, or that the Gospel has been restored in its purity; they know it by the testimony of the Holy Spirit. It is this fact, the fact that their assurances are from a Source transcending ordinary experience, and are therefore impregnable to the logic-shafts of mundane reasoners, which is so baffling to the meddlers who undertake to set them right. Picture, for instance, the chagrin of a certain Reverend Lamb—whose teeth and claws as exposed in his work proved, however, anything but lamb-like—a man who set out a few years ago with no less modest an ambition than to cause a general apostasy from the Mormon Church. So confident was he that this result must follow the publication of his diatribe against the Book of Mormon that he could scarcely conceal his exultation. Twice did he remind his readers of Orson Pratt's declaration that Mormonism must stand or fall by this ancient record; and fifty times in his book he drew the conclusion that it had fallen under his blows never to rise again. Picture then his chagrin, I repeat, when his book had no more effect on Mormonism than would a blast of foul wind.

And yet to be quite fair, this book is the severest and, from the writer's point of view, the most logically destructive arraignment yet attempted against the Book of Mormon. I remember reading it when it first came out, and my experience is no doubt more or less typical of all Mormons. Had the writer concealed his hate better; had he found something good and admirable in the book,—were it ever so small,— he might possibly have appealed to his Mormon readers with more or less effect. But when he reaches the conclusion that, aside from its quotations of scripture, the book contains only the "veriest slop, an aggregate of unnatural and silly stories," we instinctively distrust his facts, and impugn his judgment.

In reading his criticisms, I felt my soul being filled with darkness and doubt; not so much from the arguments he sets forth, which are answerable, as from inhaling the spirit of evil lurking intangibly underneath his thoughts. It was as if my spirit were in telepathic communication with the "Spirit that denies." I regained my peace of mind only by appealing to God for a renewed testimony concerning the divinity of this revelation; and I got rid of the bad taste in my mouth only by reading again the pure

wholesome thoughts, and absorbing once more the high moral atmosphere, of the book so traduced and vilified.

And now after fifteen years, I have, through the need of preparing the present article, passed once more through this painful soul experience; with similar results, however, as to my faith in the Book of Mormon, and not without improvement in moral perception; for after this last ordeal, I am more clearly able to draw the conclusion, as a maxim for my future guidance, that it is destructive to one's spiritual perception of truth to read any book begotten in hate, however striking its contents or logical its arguments.

And now briefly as to Mr. Lamb's arguments; the first, that the book is human because of its prolix style, fails even by reference to his own standard of comparison, the Bible, which has all kinds of style, from the most compact to the most diffuse. The second argument, which aims to discredit the miracles of the Book of Mormon, fails also from the fact that it can be turned, instance for instance, against the miracles of the Bible. It is merely an argument against belief in miracles. The third, in which he attempts to show that the Book of Mormon

antagonizes or undermines the Bible, is the veriest tissue of sophistry and special pleading. It has force only by virtue of sectarian bias in the reader. His two chapters on American antiquities represent the effort of a man who does not hesitate both to suppress and to exaggerate in order to make his point. As to this argument it is, as before suggested, profitable to wait; for these antiquities have scarcely begun to be studied as yet. There is finally his argument drawn from the fact that the book contains numerous quotations from the Old and New Testaments, King James' translation; and this brings me again to the question of how such a thing could have taken place.

V.

HOW THE BOOK OF MORMON WAS PROBABLY TRANSLATED.

In a consideration of this question the fundamental proposition—that on which the Mormon and his opponent must alike agree —is the fact that, howsoever he came by his material, Joseph Smith dictated the Book of Mormon, without apparent hesitation, as fast as a scribe could write it in long hand. There is no chance for error on this point. The entire Whitmer family, besides Oliver

Cowdery, Martin Harris, and Joseph's wife, sat and listened, or had free access to listen, to the record as it grew day by day during the entire month of June, 1829.

The second fact to bear in mind is, that Joseph Smith did not look directly at the plates while translating. In fact the plates, while they were in the possession of the Prophet, were probably not immediately at hand with him during most of the translation.* His method was to place the Urim and Thummim, (or else the Seer stone), under a cover,—a hat being used for this purpose; whence, the natural light being excluded, the "spiritual light would shine forth," says David Whitmer. "A piece of

*This statement is based on various considerations. First, if Joseph's eyes, while translating under a dark cover, where he had first placed the interpreters, were hidden—and both Whitmer and Harris are explicit on this point—he would not need to have the plates at hand; second, Joseph did not exclude the Whitmer family, including Oliver, Martin, and Joseph's wife, from the room in which he was translating; to have looked at the plates as one looks into a book, would have been to expose them to view, contrary to the commandment of the Lord; third, David Whitmer relates that during the translation at his father's house, he discovered evidence that the plates were hidden in the Whitmer barn, and upon asking Joseph about it, was assured that they were. The Angel Moroni seems to have been the immediate guardian of the sacred records, during the latter part of the translation.

something resembling parchment would appear and under it was the interpretation in English." With this explanation Martin Harris substantially agrees; and Mr. Lamb, after quoting Isaac Hale, Joseph's father-in-law, to the effect that the Prophet was obliged, for days at a time, to hide the plates in the woods to escape their being stolen, adds, quite as if he had scored a great point: "Yet the translation in the house *went right on all the same!*" And referring to Whitmer's statement that the angel did not return the plates to Joseph after the loss of the 116 pages manuscript,—a statement contradicted by Joseph, however,—Lamb continues: "So that when he used the Urim and Thummim, he could translate with the plates hid in the woods, and when he used his 'peep stone' the plates were of no avail as they could not be seen—while the entire closing portions of the book were translated(?) with the plates in heaven!"

The third fact worthy of note is that the dictation from start to finish proceeded while the Prophet's eyes were thus hidden from seeing anything by the natural light; what I mean to say is, he did not stop to hunt up the passages which resemble, or are identical with, passages in the King James'

version of the Bible. Such an interruption could not have escaped detection, and would surely have been noted in the accounts of the listeners. The quotations, therefore, whether direct or indirect, must be regarded as having come precisely like the rest of the matter, and probably—save in the case of direct transcriptions of chapters—without the conscious knowledge of the translator. I mean to say, that in cases where the record does not give credit,—in phrases or fragments of Bible diction,—he probably did not know at the time that he was plagiarizing.

Such in brief are the facts which any theory of translation must seek to cover. Whether the one presented below shall succeed in doing so, remains to be seen. At this point, however, let me stop to emphasize that it is only a theory, and one which, it is needless to say, I am ready to surrender the moment anything more plausible shall be presented. Moreover, as my only purpose in thinking about this matter at all, is to reconcile the findings of my head and my heart, so I shall welcome the explanations of any one else who has been thinking along this same line.

My idea, then, is that the translation of

the Book of Mormon is the joint product of two men—Joseph Smith and most probably the Angel Moroni; that the angel was commissioned by God to act for the dead quite as truly as was the Prophet for the living; that such, in fact, is the meaning of the words spoken to the Three Witnesses, declaring that the record had been translated "by the gift and power of God."

But how, the reader is ready to ask. Nothing could be simpler, as I view it. Moroni, being familiar with the characters on the plates, read them character by character; that is to say, he looked at the symbols and thereby awakened or aroused in his mind the thought corresponding to the symbols—for that is precisely what reading means. The thought so aroused passed by the power of the Spirit directly into the mind of the Prophet, who in turn rendered it into such English symbols as were at his command. Nor did the thought alone so pass: the very image of the character that held the attention of Moroni was flashed into Joseph's mind and visualized before him, just as David Whitmer says. What then would be more natural, than that the English symbols corresponding to the thought in Joseph's mind should also be projected before

him as a visual image? Thus we may account for the double line of symbols, ancient and modern, which was seen by the Prophet in the darkness surrounding the Urim and Thummim.

Now, if what was in Moroni's mind was thus flashed to Joseph's, then by the same law, what was in Joseph's would be flashed back again; that is to say, Moroni would know by the answering message whether the new symbols being set down by the scribe, corresponded in thought-content with the symbols at which he was looking; and not until then would he permit the image to fade and pass on to another. Moreover, if we can realize how visual images could thus be conveyed from mind to mind, we shall have no difficulty in understanding that auditory images could also pass; whence the explanation of how unfamiliar Nephite names could be reproduced.

Fortunately, science has taught us enough concerning the laws of thought communication,—that is to say, concerning the incipient science of telepathy,—that no fact in the above theory need stagger the student. Stranger things are taking place today in the laboratories of psychic research. By "stranger" I mean merely that telepathic

communication takes place under circumstances less simple and direct; not that scientific research has yet evolved telepathically—or probably will evolve during the next century—anything to compare with the Book of Mormon either in extent or definiteness. My idea is simply that if man has demonstrated the power of telepathy to exist, then it is surely worthy of faith that God could so shape conditions as to make the communication of the Book of Mormon possible in the manner I have suggested.

Let me add in this connection that I am not unmindful of the fact that this very attempt to explain how the translation was done,—the very attempt to bring into the realm of comprehension what has been reverently held hitherto as a mystery of faith,—may shock the sensibilities of many Latter-day Saints. To these I desire to say: It is not for you that I am writing; you may well go on ignoring all attempts at unravelling this mystery, deeply grounded as you are in the conviction that God was equal to the occasion, no matter what *modus operandi* that involved. But remember, at the same time, that your children do not start out from your point of view. Without some rational explanation of the apparent contra-

dictions respecting this book, their budding faith may be blighted. Nor is your method of disposing of the question one that Elders can use in the field, when confronted by critics of the Book of Mormon.

VI.

HOW MODERN QUOTATIONS CAME INTO THE BOOK OF MORMON.

Let us now consider some of the subsidiary questions arising from this theory. The first is naturally in relation to the Angel Moroni. Where was he when the translating was going on? If the conclusions of telepathy may be credited, the distance between minds communicating with each other is not a material consideration. He might therefore have been in the woods, where Joseph took the plates, or even in "heaven," as Mr. Lamb sarcastically suggests. The probability is that he was very near to the Prophet, perhaps in the same room. Being a resurrected person, he could function instantly either on the mortal or the spiritual plane, even as Christ did after his resurrection.

That Moroni did in fact so appear and disappear at will, is evident from two instances of his coming into and melting from

view, besides that recorded by the Three Witnesses; once to David Whitmer, Oliver Cowdery, the Prophet and his wife, while on their way in a wagon from Harmony to Seneca, and once to Mother Whitmer, when he showed her the Plates as a reward for her faithfulness in caring for Joseph and his scribe while translating. To this power of becoming visible or invisible at will are probably due also the early rumors of a "mysterious stranger" hovering around the place where the translation was going on. Moroni could therefore have stood by Joseph's side, had there been need to do so, without being seen by any mortal eye.*

The second question relates to Joseph Smith's mental qualifications. I have suggested that Moroni communicated with him through a medium common alike to the inhabitants of heaven, earth, and hell—the medium of thought divorced from all symbol. His part was consequently to put the

*As to the kind of beings who do God's commissions as angels, consider the experience of John the Revelator: "And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which shewed me these things. Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God."—Rev. 22:8, 9. Is it not about time that Christians were revising their notions concerning angels?

thought so received, into English words; and in doing so his personal equation would inevitably be stamped upon the translation, as we have seen that it was. It is important to consider now what that equation was, especially with reference to the use of words.

In respect of diction, writers are of two extreme types, with all degrees of overlapping. The one extreme is well represented by Henry Ward Beecher, who read or listened with such intensity that he could never quote: the phraseology of others having melted down like slag in the white heat of his mind and yielded up the pure gold of their ideas. When such a man writes, every phrase is coined anew and therefore stamped indelibly with the writer's individuality.

The other extreme is represented by every beginner in the thought world and, for that matter, by nine-tenths of those who grow old in it. They gather ideas with more or less avidity, both from books and men; but they stow away these ideas without undressing them,—boots and all, so to speak. Consequently, when these try to write, they proceed from phrase to phrase, rather than from word to word; and there is always a certain conventionality or triteness in their

style,—a resemblance to others in phraseology which would convict them of plagiarism, should their productions be compared critically with the authors they have read.

To this latter class belongs, as I have intimated, every tyro in composition, and therefore Joseph Smith; at least this was probably true of him during that early period when he was put to the stress of inventing the style of the Book of Mormon. As long as the thought communicated by Moroni ran along in simple narrative, the experiences of his own life furnished the Prophet with an original diction; but the moment it ascended into abstract realms, he had to draw upon his stock of phrases—upon that part of his vocabulary which, in the language of psychology, had not been apperceived or melted down in the crucible of individual experience. When we consider that this part of his vocabulary had been stored almost exclusively by contact with ministers of the Gospel, and through reading the King James' version of the Bible, we have an adequate explanation of why scriptural phraseology enters so largely into the style of the Book of Mormon.

In a word, this explanation is that the thought in the original and the thought in

the translation are the same: melted down from the symbols in each tongue, they would be identical; recast, either in the Nephite or in the English language, the thought would take a new dress as often as there should be a new matrix, i. e., a differently adjusted set of thinking powers in the translator. Had the thought of the Book of Mormon been flashed into a mind like that of Webster or Beecher, it would undoubtedly have been moulded into forms of expression which would have left no chance for the charge of plagiarism. As it was, the thought could do nothing else than take the line of least resistance, and that was the line of expression familiar to the translator through contact with the King James' version of the scriptures.

As before suggested, from the fact that the witnesses of the mode of translation have nowhere said that Joseph stopped to read passages from the Bible, it is fair to assume that those chapters which occur identical in both books, were received and dictated by the same telepathic communion as the rest of the matter; that is, the Prophet himself did not probably know, at the time of translating, how the result would compare with the English version of the Bible.

Are we then to assume that the Scriptures as known to the Nephites were identical, in form of expression, with the scriptures in the King James' version? By no means. That the thought was the same, we may well believe, since this is God's part of scripture. There is surely no difficulty in holding that Christ would give the sermon on the mount in practically the same mental concepts to the Nephites that He did to the Jews. Now, had Joseph never read the English version, he would have been obliged to coin these concepts anew as best he could; in which case his rendering would have differed from Matthew's as much at least as do those of the other three evangelists; but even if we suppose he had read Matthew's only once, we must allow that the thought would take the channel broken in preference to one unbroken, unless the translator strongly willed otherwise.

As an instance of the truth that probably no impression on the consciousness is ever completely effaced, Mr. Hudson, in his epoch-making book, "The Law of Psychic Phenomena," relates that a servant-girl, when put into the clairvoyant state, astonished her hearers by reciting perfectly a Greek poem in the original attic tongue.

Theosophists claimed the circumstance as evidence of re-incarnation; but it was finally explained that ten years previous she had been present, dusting a certain library, while a noted scholar had recited the poem to a friend. Psychic research reveals many similar instances. It is not difficult to believe, therefore, that Joseph's mind would without his knowledge retain whole chapters of the Bible, which would spring verbatim unto consciousness when brought into association with the thought that originally inspired them. This view requires that quotations and so-called plagiarisms shall always be from the King James' version.—the only Bible probably known to the early life of the Prophet,—and this, as we have seen, was the case.

VII.

AS TO THE PART PLAYED BY THE INTERPRETERS.

The next question is as to the part played by the "interpreters" in the translation. It was, of course, entirely to be expected that men of such simple minds as Martin Harris and David Whitmer should ascribe the secret of reading an ancient language to mere mechanical means; the most obvious explan-

tober 25 and 26, 1831, when pressed on this question, he replied that it was "not expedient to tell the world all the particulars of the coming forth of the Book of Mormon." Furthermore, certain facts connected with the history of the translation make it perfectly clear that, howsoever the work was done, the real theater of its doing was the Prophet's mind, not the "interpreters;" that the latter were in fact, what common-sense would declare them to be, merely a means to an end, in the same sense as the microscope, the telescope, or the telephone.

The first of these facts relates to the attempt of Oliver Cowdery to translate. He had earnestly prayed for the gift and the Lord through Joseph had promised it to him: "Yea, behold, I will tell you in your mind and in your heart, by the Holy Ghost which shall come upon you, and which shall dwell in your heart." Nevertheless when he tried to translate he could see nothing. He evidently had the notion that translating was merely a matter of looking into the Urim and Thummim, rather than of coming into spiritual *rapport* with God. "Behold," said the Lord in a later revelation, "you have not understood; you have supposed that I would give it unto you, when you took no thought,

ation being that the mystery of it lay hidden mainly in the Urim and Thummim or Seer stone.

This is, indeed, a very comfortable theory to hold—like all beliefs based on that shadowy foundation, mystery. It requires no mental exertion, no intricacy of perception, and like the account of creation in Genesis, seems so final as to be extremely soothing and bracing to dogmatic minds. Unfortunately it leaves us in two serious dilemmas. On the one hand, it makes the Prophet a mere automaton, needing no other mental qualification than ability to read words on a sign-board; and on the other it makes God responsible for all the errors,—mistakes in spelling, grammar, punctuation, diction, sentential structure, and modern quotation,—which are undoubtedly to be found in the translation. These are superficial errors, it is true, and therefore strong evidences of the genuineness of the book, if viewed as the personal equation of Joseph Smith; but inexplicable and therefore very damaging, if attributed to the Lord.

That the Prophet himself did not hold so transparently mechanical a view of his work, is evident from his silence on the real *modus operandi.* At a conference in Kirtland, Oc-

save it was to ask me. . . . You must study it out in your mind; then . . . if it is right, I will cause that your bosom shall burn within you. If not you shall have a stupor of thought that shall cause you to forget the thing which is wrong."

This incident shows that it is primarily the mind and heart, not a mechanical instrument, through which God communicates messages to man. Of similar import is the following incident, as related by David Whitmer:

> "At times when Brother Joseph would look into the hat in which the stone was placed, he found he was spiritually blind and could not translate. He told us his mind dwelt too much on earthly things.—When in this condition he would go out and pray, and when he became sufficiently humble before God, he could then proceed with the translation.—One morning when he was getting ready to continue the translation, something went wrong about the house and he was put out about it—something that Emma, his wife, had done. Oliver and I went upstairs and Joseph came up soon after—but he could not translate a single syllable. He went down stairs, out into the orchard, and made supplication to the Lord; was gone about an hour—came back to the house, asked Emma's forgiveness and then came up stairs where we were, and then the translation went on all right."

Not only do we see in this incident that it was the soul of the Prophet which had to come into communion with God,—or with the being whom God had appointed to the

work of translation,—but we also catch a glimpse of the stern conditions of that communion.

A third circumstance emphasizes the fact that the "interpreters" were merely a means to an end, and serves, moreover, to point out that end. This circumstance lies in the fact that at first God communicated with the Prophet by vision, a condition of complete abeyance of the ordinary physical consciousness; next he spoke to him through an angel,—that is, palpably, or as one man speaks to another; then he revealed his will through the Urim and Thummim,—a condition of physical consciousness, but involving at the same time intense psychic concentration; later communications occur through the "Seer stone," an ordinary chocolate-colored pebble, but always under similar conditions of complete abstraction from things worldly; at last we find the Prophet communing with God without need of aid from instrument of any kind.

In this series may be seen the gradual growth of Joseph's telepathic powers. The conclusion seems inevitable that the "interpreters" were merely a means of helping the Prophet so to withdraw his mind from the

physical plane, as to enter into correspondence with beings on the spiritual plane.

Consider how admirable was this arrangement of means to secure the end which I have suggested. The head-covering effectually shut out the objects of the natural world, and focused expectation on the inner world; for there, whispered faith, at a point a few inches from the eye, on the very surface of the medium, would presently appear the message. The Prophet had only to wait in a spirit of quiet concentration. He had perfect faith in the efficacy of the instrument; for had it not been consecrated to the purpose? That very fact would engender the child-like expectancy necessary to communion with another mind through the medium of the Holy Ghost. Presently the spiritual light burst—the characters appeared—the translation went on.

Any object consecrated by God, and sufficiently believed in by man, would have had a like effect. Indeed, the crown of the hat, could faith have been made expectant enough by it, would have served the same purpose,—provided it had also been accepted by God. The best of mechanical contrivances are probably only crutches to help

keep steady a limping faith. A handkerchief sent by the Prophet healed the sick once; not because there was virtue in this fragment of linen, but because it awakened and concentrated faith. In this present life we must see as we can, "through a glass darkly;" there comes a time for all of us, as there did for the Prophet, when we shall see "face to face," without need of mechanical medium.

Note well the reciprocal aspect, above pointed out, respecting any revelation given to man. A medium of communion—such as the Seer stone—may be sanctioned by God, yet be ineffectual unless it serves to quicken in man the faith necessary to such communion. On the other hand, man may set up some medium in which he has all confidence, yet his faith will be vain, if God does not accept it as a basis of communion.

Such an explanation will help us to understand the outcome of a trick played by Martin Harris on the Prophet while they were translating the 116 pages of manuscript which were afterward lost. Martin had slyly substituted for the "Steer stone," an oval-shaped pebble just like it, which he had picked up on the river bank. On looking into the hat, Joseph exclaimed: "What is

the matter, Martin? All is as dark as Egypt." Martin's face betrayed him. "Why did you do that?" censured Joseph. "To stop the mouths of fools, who say you are repeating all this out of your head," was the reply.

The Angel Moroni, acting for God, could not permit the trick to succeed, even though Joseph's faith was perfect. It is to be feared, however, that Martin drew the wrong conclusion from the failure. He probably decided that "seer" stones are intrinsically different, by internal structure, from stones of the same chemical composition and otherwise resembling them; the true conclusion probably is that the difference is one made entirely by the will of God. That medium only is accepted which he himself appoints, not that which man appoints for him. Had the stone picked up by Martin been set apart instead of the other, as a means of bridging for Joseph the chasm between the natural and the spiritual plane, there is no reason whatever why it should not have served the purpose equally well.

The principle involved in this distinction is a vital one; for on it hinges our attitude toward all man-constituted agencies of salvation, as well as toward the fetich or relic

worship so common in one division of the Christian world. It is not denied that God's will may endow with miraculous powers otherwise inanimate things; as for instance, Aaron's rod that budded; the Ark of the Covenant whence issued the voice of Jehovah; the Brass ball or directors given to Lehi, which pointed the direction to travel; and the sixteen stones cut from the mountain by the Brother of Jared, which became luminous by the touch of the finger of the Lord. But in all these cases the power still resides in the will of God: should any attempt be made to use them for purposes different from those to which they were consecrated, they would perhaps instantly become as inert and useless as so much similar raw material. It is to be hoped that Latter-day Saints will never forget this fact—that power to do is inseparable from intelligence, and intelligence is possible only to a sentient being; else we shall be in danger of such superstitions as believing, for instance, that a fragment of the true Cross, or the so-called holy grail, or any other piece of inert matter, is endowed with divine powers simply from having been casually associated with the Savior, or some other exalted being.

That the Urim and Thummim or Seer stone had a definite part to play in the translation,—whether the simple mission of assisting the Prophet to spiritual concentration, as I have suggested, or some other,—matters not now; the thing to bear in mind is that the Book of Mormon is the product—let the means be what they may—of an intelligence in the spiritual plane reacting upon an intelligence in a mortal plane; that is to say, the vital issue in this problem of translation is one of mind not one of matter.

VIII.

CONCLUSION: THE BOOK OF MORMON A DIVINE RECORD.

The last question I shall treat in this essay relates to the book itself. Is it an inspired record? Was the Prophet right in declaring that a man would be able to get the truths of the Gospel more nearly pure from this revelation than from any other scripture?

Several interesting phases of this question immediately present themselves. The first is as to the relation of truth to the dress it wears. Suppose you should read in the Book of Mormon this sentence: "Whoredoms is an abomination in the sight of the

Lord." Is it less a truth to you that the translator made the divine affirmation with a singular instead of a plural verb? If it is, perish the culture that has made your mental palate so finical—the false education which discovers surfaces to your mind but hides depths! The Book of Mormon will no doubt be a stumbling block to you; for you are of that carping type which seek error rather than truth. With such a soul-attitude, there are no native, unelaborated truths in God's universe for you: even diamonds are but worthless pebbles in your path, until someone has cut and polished them. All nature conspires to hide the reality and fill your mind with the show of things. In the language of scripture, God (i. e. the harmony of the universe) sends you strong delusions that you may believe a lie and be damned; simply because the love of truth is not in you.

Take another sentence—which Lamb says "caps the climax of absurdities" in the faulty grammar and diction of the book. If it really is the worst specimen, as this carping critic says, then no verbal error is bad at all, at least in the sense of hiding or obscuring the thought. Here is the sentence: "He went forth among the people, waving

the rent of his garment in the air, that all might see the writing which he had wrote on the rent." If the love of truth is in your soul, the real thought in this passage will not fail you. Let the symbols be what they may, this is what you read: "He went forth among the people waving the rent garment in the air that all might see the words he had written upon it."

Moreover, if the occasion leading up to the manifesto described in these words, has been appreciated, you will be quite blind to the trivial slips in diction; for you will realize with intense interest that this was the first suggestion of a battle flag among the Nephites. At a critical moment in a terrible war, Moroni "rent his coat, and taking a piece thereof he wrote upon it: In memory of our God, our religion, our freedom, and our peace, our wives, and our children." This improvised ensign he raised on a pole, calling it the "title of liberty." Surely the interests to which he appealed are the most deep and searching in the human heart; and when we read how the device caused the people to rally round him, and became in time a precious national heirloom,—the last trace of vexation, which we may have felt respecting the faulty symbols of the thought,

is swallowed in our admiration for the greatness of the thought itself.

And so of all other passages complained of by critics. The man who primarily seeks thought, caring little to scrutinize its dress—the man who reads while he runs—will not fail to have his soul stirred as was his who wrote and his who translated the record; ambiguities lie only in the path of the supercritical. That these latter should stumble along, finding only matter for offense in the book, is as if some rare exotic of a tenderfoot, viewing the magnificent expanse of one of our deserts, should be blind to the deep overarching blue resting on its endlessly varied horizon, deaf to the silent eloquence of its solitudes, and insensible to its prodigal wealth of pure air and glorious sunshine —all because his dainty toe came in contact with one of its prickly pears!

Elsewhere I have intimated that had a mind like Beecher furnished the symbols of thought for the Book of Mormon we should have had a record as full of subtle surprises in diction as the present translation is innocently free of them. It would then have passed muster perhaps as an English classic. But would the underlying truths, which form the soul of the book, have been the more divinely inspired that they were

dressed to suit the taste of grammarian and rhetorician? As well say that the forests on our mountain tops show no evidence of a divine hand, because nowhere do they conform to the artistic designs of the landscape gardener.

The next question is as to the relationship of truth and him who gives it an earthly dress. That God should have chosen an unlettered youth like Joseph Smith to be the mouthpiece of so important a revelation, is incredible to many good people. Nor do I wish to dismiss this objection with the usual remark that God's ways are not man's ways and must therefore not be judged by the same standard. Nevertheless, in order to look at the question rationally, it may be well to put it in this way:

Suppose that no higher wisdom than that of which man is capable should have guided our Father in heaven in choosing a prophet to usher in this new dispensation—a dispensation which, be it remembered, was predestined to be widely divergent from the received religions of the world,—would that wisdom have chosen a mind unbiased toward any prevalent system, even though it were illiterate, or would it have chosen a mind keenly bright and educated, but set in its moral and spiritual stand-

ards? Which would be the easier problem, to brighten the unused, illiterate mind to the point wherein it could do God's service, or bend to new ideals and make instantly plastic to His will, the fixed soul-attitude of some world-renowned religious philosopher?

Picture Jonathan Edwards, for instance, giving up piece by piece, under the influence of God's command, the cherished mental creations of his life, and stripping himself little by little of the vestments of popularity so dear to him, to clothe himself instead in the sack-cloth and ashes of universal theological reprobation! He could no more have done it than a camel can get through the eye of a needle. I do not mean to assert that, had he truly realized such mental readjustment was God's command, he would yet have lacked the moral courage necessary for martyrdom, or even for what would have been harder to him—ostracism; he may or may not have lacked such courage. What I mean to say is, that he was so opinionated that God could never have made him realize something as His will which involved the tearing up of the very anchorage of his spiritual life.

The reader will probably agree with me, then, that looked at from the human point

of view the untrammeled mind of Joseph Smith was a better medium for God's purposed iconoclasm, than would have been the mind of any other man with a hundred times the mental polish, yet lacking the necessary plasticity. But even had this not been so, there was practically no other course left for the Lord than to choose just such a mind.

We say, indeed, that nothing is impossible to God,—by which we probably mean that all things are possible to him which are not impossible in themselves. This, however, God cannot do and remain God: he cannot compel men to come unto him; for that would be taking away their free agency. In the early days of the Prophet, learned theologians, however they might differ among themselves respecting creed and ritual, were unanimous on one thing; viz, that there was never to be any more communication between God and man, as in Bible days. To them, therefore, the book of revelation was closed and sealed; and this, too, not only in theory but also in fact. For had there not been a mind on the earth constituted like Joseph Smith's—a mind willing to receive new revelation,—God would literally have been barred out from further conscious counsel in the affairs of men, by sheer want of faith on man's part.

So much from man's point of view. Let us now try to look at this question from God's point of view.

While we may admit that Joseph Smith was illiterate, and as the world views learning, might even have been called ignorant, yet we are by no means prepared to concede that any man in his day and time stood higher in the scale of intelligence, as God measures souls. In Mormon theology man does not figure as merely the ephemeral creature of mortality—doubtful of past or future existence. On the contrary, there is in him that which is co-eternal with the universe. And so varied and significant was the life he led during (perhaps) millions of years with God, that every soul born into mortality might, in lesser degree, pray the prayer of our Elder Brother: "Father, glorify thou me with the glory I had with thee, before the world was."

And what is more, the present life of any soul may still be open in the direction of its Maker, if that soul wills to keep the gates of faith ajar; though God, cannot keep them open without the soul's consent. If therefore our Father should desire a spirit to do work of salvation on this lowly plane of earth in behalf of its fellow spirits who have

shut the gate between themselves and God, to whom would he speak, if not to that soul whose channel of spiritual communion is still open? And so also in judging the fitness of any man for such a divine commission, which think you God would gauge him by, the fitful moments of his earthly career, or the measureless record of his pre-existence?

It does not follow, therefore, because a man has not won a recognized intellectual standing among men, that his intelligence,—that is to say, his capacity for receiving and acting out Truth—is less than that of the greatest of earthly savants. Which, indeed, of the Bible prophets, if we except the Apostle Paul, could claim the credence of mankind on the score of learning? Were they not all, with this single exception, of the same type as Joseph Smith?—Men whose greatness lay solely in the fact that their souls were prisms through which the white light of infinite Truth was differentiated into the myriad-hued duties and obligations of social life; duties and obligations the daily reactions from which bring man nearer to God.

"Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, and before thou camest forth out of the

womb, I sanctified thee, and ordained thee a prophet unto the nations." This is the way in which one of these obscure men—Jeremiah—was called; that is to say, God chose him in view of his record during pre-existence, not because of any earthly pre-eminence to which he might attain; which is probably the way in which all his servants are chosen for their earthly missions.

Coming back then to Joseph Smith and the Book of Mormon, let us bless the memory of the unlettered boy whose trust in God did not falter; from out whose mouth streamed forth, even though in faltering phrase, the history of a buried civilization; who did not stop to argue with the Lord, or insist upon his point of view, but spoke right on as thoughts and emotions were awakened in his soul; whose life, though not free from errors of judgment, exemplified daily the prayer of our Savior: "Father, thy will, not mine, be done;" and whose death placed him in the ranks of those who have died for the testimony of Jesus.

As to the Book of Mormon, it is not a human invention because it is dressed in the garb of human phraseology. Like the Bible, it has a soul apart from its incarnation in words—a truthness that shall live on,

though words change their meaning and grow obsolete; and like some majestic pine that sloughs the dried and withered branches which have ceased to serve its life, so in time will the Book of Mormon free itself from those errors in word and phrase which are blemishes now only to the superficial man, but which do not hide the beauty and symmetry of its inner truths to the soul that is earnestly seeking the way of life.

From Patriarch Charles D. Evans, a man as scholarly as he is spiritual-minded, comes the following comment on the leading article of the last number: "Its philosophy is searching, and places religion in direct harmony with natural law. It is a work of intense thought, and a thorough refutation of that theology whose narrowness separates religion from the universe of which it is an essential part. I was struck with your description of the Sons of Perdition (note, p. 50): 'Men in respect of obedience to God are like beacon-fires: as long as a spark of the divine life remains, it can be kindled unto repentance; but suppose it goes out,—can you rekindle ashes? The Sons of Perdition are merely the ash-heaps of divine fires that have gone out',—a comparison which portrays the awful condition with a lucidity which makes one almost feel the spirit of their hopelessness."

THE DICTIONARY OF SLANDER.

Of one thing in respect to Mormonism the world seems absolutely convinced, viz., that Joseph Smith could not have written the Book of Mormon. For a long while therefore it rested easy in its eager acceptance of the Hurlbut, alias Howe, invention that the new Bible was none other than the stolen manuscript of Solomon Spaulding. Hurlbut found no difficulty in securing a dozen sworn statements, from men who claimed to have heard Spaulding read his story, identifying the names and incidents of the two books. Especially did these affidavits dwell on one identical mannerism in the style, viz., the oft-recurring phrase "It came to pass." What more proof was needed where everyone was more than willing to believe?

From this complaisant attitude, the world was, however, rudely awakened when Mr. Fairchilds, president of the Oberlin College, Ohio, discovered Spaulding's long-lost manuscript—among a lot of old papers in the library of his friend, Mr. L. L. Rice of Honolulu, and with its publication vanished the last screen protecting this old refuge of liars and lies. Hurlbut, Howe, and the other conscienceless scoundrels* whom they induced to swear to false affidavits, stood out naked for what they were. So far from the words "Nephi, Lehi, Lamanite, Nephite and all the principal names" of the Book of Mormon being in the Sapulding story, there

*I have looked at this word "scoundrels" both in hot manuscript and also in cold print, debating whether to change it. I first try to think, with President Fairchilds, that the time was so remote when these men listened to Spaulding's readings, that the two stories have since become confounded in their memories. Then I turn to the "Manuscript Found" and read Hurlbut's own endorsement thereon: "The Writings of Solomon Spalding Proved by Aron Wright Oliver Smith John Miller and others [the very men who signed these affidavits]. The testimonies of the above gentlemen are now in my possession;" and when I fully realize that this is therefore the story in which they make affidavit to finding "Nephi, Lehi, Lamanite," etc., and the words "It came to pass," so often recurring that they were led to nickname Spaulding "Old come-to-pass;" and when I remember, furthermore, that Hurlbut could have made this endorsement only in 1834, the year when he got this manuscript from Mrs. Spaulding's trunk and turned it over to E. D. Howe—two years before Howe's book, containing Hurlbut's testimonies, appeared; and consequently must conclude that Hurlbut and Howe knew, and these men knew that they were deliberately swearing to a falsehood,—when I realize all this I must let the word stand with all of Webster's signification: "A mean, worthless fellow; a man without honor or virtue." Moreover, when I reflect that these men were not loath thus to cast aspersion on a whole people, because forsooth it was safe, even popular, to do so, I leave also the word "conscienceless" to keep the word "scoundrels" company.

proved to be not even the remotest likeness between them. "Mr. Rice, myself and others," writes President Fairchilds, "have compared it with the Book of Mormon, and could detect no resemblance between the two in general or in detail. There seems to be no name or incident common to the two."

This was in 1884. For twenty years the traducers of Mormonism were paralyzed by the unwelcome revelation. Now comes one William Alexander Linn, who attempts to resurrect the old slander with two important variations: first, that the original of the Book of Mormon was another story by Solomon Spaulding, and second, that it was doctored up and made a religious romance by Sidney Rigdon. The latter variation became necessary because of the fact that the Reverend(!) Solomon Spaulding, held for so long to be an eminent Presbyterian divine, turned out, by his own confessions, to be a rank infidel.*

*"It [the Christian Religion] is in my view a mass of contradictions and an heterogeneous mixture of wisdom and folly—nor can I find any clear and incontrovertable evidence of its being a revelation from an Infinite benevolent and wise God . . . . . I disavow any belief in the divinity of the Bible and consider it a mere human production designed to enrich and aggrandize its authors & to enable them to manage the multitude."—Solomon Spaulding's confession of faith, an addendum to the "Manuscript Found." Could such a foundation be the source of the pure and exalted spirituality of the Book of Mormon? Linn evidently thinks not, whence the need of working in Sidney Rigdon.

SIDNEY RIGDON A THIEF AND FORGER.

That is the proposition which Linn must next sustain, if he is to account for the Book of Mormon as a rehash of the Spaulding Manuscript. The difficulties are tremendous and might well stagger even so steady a hater as he, were it not that he feels instinctively how anything will pass for proof against Mormonism.

For instance, he has first to prove that Spaulding wrote a story that is within gunshot likeness of the Book of Mormon. Had the "Manuscript Found" been burned, as Hurlbut thought it was, this would have been very easy,—judging by the affidavits Hurlbut, alias Howe, collected; but as it turns up in all its amateur crudity, Mr. Linn must show that Spaulding wrote "another" manuscript, "going further back with dates, and writing in the old scripture style, in order that it might appear more ancient."

He must next get this manuscript where Sidney Rigdon can copy it surreptitiously—in other words, steal it outright. Mr. Rigdon must, moreover, be supplied with a mo-

tive for stealing it: This motive Mr. Linn finds in a deep-laid plot by Rigdon to start a new religion, in order to get revenge on the "Campbells," who got all the glory for founding the Disciple or Campbellite Church—a glory which Rigdon should have shared.

Rigdon must next have been attracted—somehow—to Joseph Smith as the very man to become the prophet of the new dispensation. Accordingly he makes Rigdon prepare the copy of the Book of Mormon, by injecting into the "other" Spaulding's manuscript the religious dogmas of the Campbellites, and then makes him take it by installments to Joseph Smith; who, hid behind a screen, dictates it to a scribe, quite according to the verified account of its coming forth. Rigdon thereby becomes the "mysterious visitor," seen entering and leaving Joseph's house occasionally, in the early accounts by the Prophet's neighbors.

But now come two difficulties. The first is that Rigdon, whose motive for theft and forgery was to get even with the Campbells for robbing him of glory, consents nevertheless to play second fiddle to Joseph Smith and to be "snubbed and ill-treated" by the very tool of his successful villainy. Mr.

Linn sees in the latter fact some deep mysterious power which the younger man exercised over the older,—quite in the dime novel fashion. The other difficulty is the very consistent, logical, undeviating account by Joseph Smith of each successive event in the coming forth of the Book of Mormon. But this narrative, Mr. Linn points out, was not written till 1838, ten years after the translation of the Book of Mormon, and seven years after Sidney Rigdon joined the Church—time enough for the arch-plotter Rigdon to make the invention smooth and plausible!

Let us now take up these various aspects and see in what shape they leave this last traducer of Mormonism. Mr. Linn (p. 52) quotes from the "Boston Recorder," May, 1839, what purports to be Mrs. Davison's history of her former husband's story. "After giving an account of the writing of the story, her statement continues as follows:"

"Here (in Pittsburg) Mr. Spaulding found a friend and acquaintance in the person of Mr. Patterson, who was very much pleased with it, and borrowed it for perusal. He retained it for a long time, and informed Mr. Spaulding that, if he would make out a title page and preface, he would publish it, as it might be a source of

profit. This Mr. Spaulding refused to do. Sidney Rigdon, who has figured so largely in the history of the Mormons, was at that time connected with the printing office of Mr. Patterson, as is well known in that region, and, as Rigdon himself had frequently stated, became acquainted with Mr. Spaulding's manuscript and copied it. It was a matter of notoriety and interest to all connected with the printing establishment At length the manuscript was returned to its author, and soon after he removed to Amity where Mr. Spaulding deceased in 1816. The manuscript then fell into my hands, and was carefully preserved."

There are four trifling objections, however, to the truth of this explanation: (1) Mrs. Davison, Spaulding's widow, came out with an affidavit immediately afterward, discrediting many of the facts in this letter and denying that she wrote it. It was subsequently proved to be the concoction of one Reverend(!) D. R. Austin. (2) "Rigdon himself in a letter addressed to the Boston Journal, under date of May 27, 1839, denied all knowledge of Spaulding," so Linn admits, "and declared that there was no printer named Patterson in Pittsburg during his residence there." (3) The manuscript has, as we have seen, been found and identified. It is, moreover, a piece of writing that no sane man would think of copying. (4) Spaulding died in 1816, and as the theft

is purported to have been before that, it was at least fifteen years previous to the coming out of the Book of Mormon, or at a time when Rigdon could not have had the motive imputed to him.*

Nevertheless, on the strength of this pious invention Mr. Linn proceeds to build up his hypothesis of another manuscript, and of Rigdon's theft and forgery; bolstering it by the affidavits of such men as John N. Miller and Aaron Wright, above quoted—men who are demonstrated to have sworn to lies. Linn's subterfuge is, however, unworthy of credence for following reasons: (1) Spaulding never claimed anywhere or to anyone to have written more than one story about ancient America. (2) His wife refers constantly to only one—the "Manuscript Found." (3) His daughter, whose testimony has already been quoted, mentions no other, though she often went through his papers in the old trunk and handled this manuscript, which, she says, was "about an inch thick and closely writ-

*The Campbellite or "Disciples of Christ" Church was not launched till 1827. Should Rigdon have developed the motives of jealousy gratuitously imputed to him by Linn, he would have found it somewhat difficult to reach back previous to the year 1816, to get the means of gratifying his pique against Campbell!

ten." (4) Hurlbut got permission to open this trunk, and found but one story—the "Manuscript Found"—which he turned over to E. D Howe.*

Any one of these reasons must seriously discredit Mr. Linn's theory, but here is a reason absolutely fatal to it: Solomon Spaulding not only did not, he could not, write the narrative of the Book of Mormon. It is not possible for the author of the crude story from which I have quoted, to have changed his style to one so totally unlike it as that of the Book of Mormon. On this point no bolstering by false affidavits will count: there are the two styles side by side.† The transition from one to the other would not have been possible, even to the versatility of a Shakespeare, without leav-

*What Huribut was looking for was the story that should support the charge he had already made respecting the Book of Mormon: whence the meaning of his words, as quoted by Linn: "Why, if it had been the real one, I could have sold it for $3,000."

†"It is unlikely," comments President Fairchild, "that any one who wrote so elaborate a work as the Mormon Bible would spend his time getting up so shallow a story as this - - Mr. Rice, myself, and others compared it with the Book of Mormon, and could detect no resemblance between the two in general or in detail. There seems to be no name or incident common to the two. - - - - Some other explanation of the origin of the Book of Mormon must be found."

ing some trace of similarity in name, geographical allusion, diction, phraseology, or imagery. Yet this very miracle of transformation, which, as every scholar will admit, would not be possible even to a master of style, Mr. Linn would have us believe possible to a mind all but fossilized in its sterile rigidity,—a style whose very sentential structure proclaims almost an entire absence of versatility!

This much-exploited plagiary canard, as well as Linn's recent variation of it, rests therefore solely on the malicious invention of an apostate bent upon doing harm to the religion which had cast him out. That the world believed it so eagerly, is explanation enough for the subsidiary lies with which it has been bolstered from time to time. The new turn which Linn gives to the slander, is likely to be received also with similar avidity; nor will it lack confirmation from the "makers and lovers" of a lie when it has had sufficient time to breed them. At present it seems a little immature,—lacking even pin feathers to hide its nakedness.

Mr. Linn made the mistake, moreover, of relying upon the affidavits of the perjured witnesses quoted by Howe. He should have engaged Hurlbut to get up some new affi-

davits. No doubt if the notorious apostate is still alive, he could easily find some white-haired confederate who would remember Spaulding; remember hearing him read this crude story; remember distinctly suggesting to him that he write another story, entirely unlike it, tracing the origin of the Indians back to the Israelites; and who would, for a consideration, recollect "as if it were yesterday" how he visited his gifted friend a year or two later and listened, during the long winter evenings, to this new story. It can be done yet, Mr. Linn; and the world is hungering and thirsting for just such romance. Moreover, this is a progressive age,—why not trot out some fresh lies?

Unfortunately for Linn and his cult, we have a sufficient arc of Mr. Spaulding's authorship to determine accurately his literary orbit; and as before suggested, ten thousand affidavits could not bring that orbit within the circle of the Book of Mormon. The proof of this, for any sane man, is the unbiased reading of both books. As no scintilla of reliable evidence exists that Spaulding ever wrote another book, and as the proof is overwhelming that he could not, from sheer want of literary power, have written the Book of Mormon,—as, in short,

there was no Spaulding's story for Rigdon to steal and doctor up—I might dismiss at once all the correlative rubbish with which Linn seeks to make his new theory plausible.

But I perceive that, driven from this mooring, writers of the Linn type will not be long,—with a million readers ready to gulp down any invention whatsoever against the Mormons,—in shifting to a position like this: Sidney Rigdon being of a deeply religious turn of mind, and a clever writer* moreover, took his hint from Spaulding, and produced the Book of Mormon entire; palming it off on the world through Joseph Smith, in order the more effectually to establish a new religion. This is really in effect what Linn claims was done; for to inject into any hypothetical Spaulding story the religious coloring of the Book of Mormon, would involve the rewriting of the story *in toto*. Let us see how the theory works out.

*Which, however, he was not, by any means, if we may judge by the fragments of composition he has left behind. Linn publishes a letter from him dated May 25, 1873, which has a number of errors in syntax and spelling, and which closes with this curious error in diction: "I struggle along in poverty to which I am consigned." [resigned.]

RIGDON AND THE BOOK OF MORMON.

In 1828, so we are informed by Mr. Linn, an important church discussion took place between Sidney Rigdon and Alexander Campbell at Warren, Ohio; "Rigdon having sprung on the meeting an argument in favor of a community of goods," like that prevailing among the ancient saints, and Campbell combatting the idea and winning the audience over to his way of thinking. On his way home Rigdon is quoted as saying to a brother: "I have done as much in this reformation as Campbell or Scott, and yet they get all the honor of it."

"In this jealousy of the Campbells," continues Linn, "and in the discomfiture as a leader which he received at their hands, we find a sufficient object for Rigdon's desertion of his old church associations and desire to build up something, the discovery of which he could claim, and the government of which he could control."

That is to say, the motive which is to make him steal Spaulding's manuscript, inject into it the tenets of the Disciple theology, cozen Joseph Smith into acting the part of prophet of the new dispensation, etc., etc., arose in pique over being worsted in an

argument! And that, too, in a fold not his own; for by Linn's own statement, Rigdon continued preaching in the Disciples' church at Mentor and Kirtland for two more years, and actually organized churches on the plan of owning things in common. Moreover, Mr. Hayden, historian of the Disciples' church, says of him during these years: "The uniformity of his life, his undeviating devotion, his high and consistent manliness and superiority of judgment, gave him an undisputed pre-eminence in the church."

But in order to get a start, let us grant the motive for appropriating Spaulding's story and inveigling Joseph Smith from money digging and the low vagabond life, which Linn says he was leading, into setting up for prophet, while he, Rigdon, furnished the brains! His first difficulty is to get possession of Spaulding's story. Spaulding has been dead twelve years, and he must now reach back further than that to get hold of it. Alas, for lost opportunities!

Linn gets past this difficulty by assuming that he has it already in his possession. Like a crutch, this precious manuscript was a handy thing to have in the house in an emergency and so Rigdon copied it some fourteen years previously in Patterson's

printing office and laid it by,—shrewd man that he was!

Here is a sample of how Linn proves(!) this latter fact: "Mrs. Ellen E. Dickenson in a report of a talk with General and Mrs. Garfield on the subject, at Mentor, Ohio, in 1880, [64 years after the alleged theft] reports Mrs. Garfield as saying 'that her father told her that Rigdon in his youth lived in that neighborhod, and made mysterious visits to Pittsburg!"

He said that Mrs. G. said that her father said that—! How far can you carry water in a sieve of that kind? Here is another: "Dr. Winter's daughter wrote to Robert Patterson on April 5, 1881 [65 years after the alleged theft]: 'I have frequently heard my father speak of Rigdon having Spaulding's manuscript, and that he had gotten it from the printer's to read as a cruiosity; as such he showed it to father, and at that time Rigdon had no intention of making the use of it he afterward did." Dr. Winter's daughter is evidently mistaken; the idea must really have been lurking in his bones. Why else should his visits to Pittsburg have been "mysterious?" True, Rigdon is not a minister yet for three years; Campbell, who is to rob him of glory in a debate twelve years

later, is barely over from Scotland, but not yet cut loose from Presbyterianism; and "Joe" Smith is probably "sprouting" on his father's clearing in Vermont. Still, the fact that he made "mysterious" visits to Pittsburg is full of significance!

Was ever giddy rot like this stuffed down the gullets of gudgeons before? Why should Sidney Rigdon, a farmer's boy, be a "hanger-on" round a printing press in a remote city? Why should he go there mysteriously? It is not claimed that he stole the original manuscript. Spaulding left that with his widow safely locked up in a trunk. If it was at the printer's he must have understood that it was there to be printed. Why then should he copy it, knowing he could buy it soon in book form? If it was the crude, shallow manuscript that has since turned up—and there is no evidence that Spaulding ever wrote any other—what lunacy could be supposed in him to steal it? And if he stole it, point out one name, one phrase, one incident of it in the Book of Mormon today!

It will be remembered that Mr. Linn in his preface posed as the judicial historian. What sharp-nosed old granny in poke-bonnet and spectacles is it then that is here col-

lecting the veriest hearsay gossip of the second and third generation removed, to sustain his desperate point?

It would be a pity, however, not to see what he can make of it, so let us grant that Spaulding wrote another story and that Rigdon, in his mysterious visits, copied it in 1816, and had it by him when, in 1828, he was worsted by Campbell and resolved to get even by setting up a rival religion.

It is not contended that Rigdon began doctoring Spaulding's manuscript till after this tilt with Campbell in 1828—there would have been no motive for it. After that, it must have taken time—months at least—to recast the secular story so as to saturate it with Disciple theology—and this theology, it must be remembered, is one of the strong reasons put forward by Linn for Rigdon's authorship. But Joseph Smith claims to have received the Gold Plates from the Angel on September 22, 1827, and to have copied and translated some of the characters in December; while Martin Harris actually made his memorable visit to Prof. Anthon with them the following February.

"Mr. Harris returned to my house about the 12th of April, 1828," writes Joseph Smith, "and commenced writing for me

while I translated from the Plates, which we continued until the 14th of June following, by which time we had written one hundred and sixteen pages of manuscript, on foolscap paper." Hardly time,—was there? —for Rigdon to round up his plot and get it into the harness!

But difficulties increase the moment you attempt to conceive Rigdon's part in getting out the Book of Mormon. Is it thinkable that he could have had this manuscript by him, with no obligation to secrecy, for twelve years, yet no one of his flock or fellow ministers ever see it? Could he now set about the tremendous work of reshaping or rewriting or composing outright, if you will, the 350,000 words of the Book of Mormon, and go on smoothly with his pastoral work in two or three towns at the same time, and yet none of his intimates be aware of it? Unaccustomed to literary effort, he would be a long time getting into working shape, but allowing an average of 2,000 words a day,—a heavy record even for a facile writer, —it would take over six months of week-days without a break, to complete the task. Where could he have hidden the secret of his work during that time? Being a poor man he would necessarily have to write in

the living room of his home. It is impossible that his wife and four children, one of whom was ten years old, should not have been privy to the secret, and every visitor to the house would have guessed it; so that when he deserted the Campbellite fold, the truth would have been disclosed and published far and wide.

But no such evidence can be found. Linn quotes two hearsay testimonies, years after the event, that Rigdon knew the Book of Mormon was coming forth; but any one living where he did might have known that. for it was no secret that Joseph had received the Plates and was translating them. Again he quotes Rigdon as having said in 1830 that "it was time for a new religion to spring up." He probably referred to Campbellism, which was not so definitely established as to be an old religion.

No matter how this theory is turned over, it fails to hold water. Look at these inconsistencies, for instance: Rigdon chafes at second place under Campbell, a noted religious philosopher, yet voluntarily chooses second place under a "disreputable money-digger" (*sic*, Linn) and his own cat's paw; he quarrels with Campbell over the church holding things in common and is allowed

to have his way in his own congregations, yet he now goes over to a new religion which does not recognize this pet innovation; with the Disciples he is counted a great man and receives a salary, yet he takes up with Mormonism at a sacrifice of that salary, and under the penalty of ostracism—all for pique! Talk about Mormon credulity! Who is doing the alligator act here?

Thus far I have dealt only with Mr. Linn's own facts, and they have proved so utterly inadequate to support his theory, that I might well rest my case without considering the evidence on the Mormon side at all. For have we not seen that from four successive dilemmas, anyone of which would prove fatal to his theory, Mr. Linn was permitted to escape, just to give his reasoning a chance to be aired? Only to see him treed at last by the fact that he brings in his puppet one year too late with copy!

RIGDON'S TRUE PLACE IN MORMONISM.

Listen now to the simple, unimpeachable facts in the career of Sidney Rigdon: Born February 19, 1793, of parents whose forefathers, three generations previously, came from Great Britain, he passed his youth and

early manhood on his father's farm at St. Clair township, Alleghany county, Pennsylvania. In his twenty-fifth year he joined the "Regular Baptists," and the next year (March, 1819) left the farm and made his home with the Rev. Andrew Clark, Baptist minister at Pittsburg—too late by three years to meet Spaulding. Here he took out his minister's license, and in May following moved to Trumbull county, Ohio, where he met Phebe Brook, to whom he was married June 12, 1820.

Having in the meanwhile attained to some celebrity as a preacher, he received a call from the Baptist society of Pittsburg, and became their regular minister in February, 1822. But misgivings began to arise as to many tenets held by this sect—especially as to the baptism of infants—which led him to retire from the ministry in August, 1824, and take up the tanning business in connection with his brother-in-law, Richard Brook.

During the two years that he worked at this trade, he often met and conversed with Alexander Campbell and Walter Scott, ministers also dissatisfied with their creeds. The result was eventually the founding, in 1827, of a new society, the "Disciples of Christ,"

whose professed rule of faith was a return to the simple doctrines of Christ as set forth in Scripture,—faith in God, repentance of sins, baptism by immersion for the remission of sins, holiness of life, a godly walk and conversation,—untrammeled by credal interpretation. Rigdon began preaching the new doctrines in 1826, and was so successful that he soon had large followings in Mentor, Bainbridge, Kirtland, and many of the surrounding townships.

It was here, at Mentor, four years later, while in the zenith of his popularity and in full fellowship with Campbell—Linn to the contrary*—that Mormonism found and claimed him. That is to say, it was late in the fall of 1830, nine months after the Book of Mormon was printed, and six or seven months after the Church had been organized, and when the membership had grown to about ninety souls. So much for Rig-

*The remark attributed by Linn to Rigdon after the Warren controversy, as well as the fact of the controversy itself, is substantiated by no authority save Linn, and is therefore in all probability a gratuitous invention for the sake of getting up a case. But if you suppose it to be a real expression, it counts only for one of those straws of vexation with his brother which float in the current of every minister's life. There is no proof that there were any but amicable feelings between Rigdon and Campbell till after the former accepted Mormonism.

don's alleged authorship of the Book of Mormon, and mastership in the founding of Mormonism.

Rigdon's conversion was on this wise: Four Elders—Parley P. Pratt, Oliver Cowdery, Peter Whitmer, Jr., and Ziba Peterson—had been called on a mission to carry the Book of Mormon to the Lamanites, that is, to the American Indians, descendants of the Lamanites. They first called on a tribe near Buffalo. Their route next brought them into the very heart of the region where Campbellism had taken so strong a foothold since its organization three years previous. Says the Prophet Joseph Smith in his Autobiography:

"The first house at which they called in the vicinity of Kirtland was Mr. Rigdon's; and after the usual salutations, they presented him with the Book of Mormon, stating that it was a revelation from God. This being the first time he had ever heard of or seen the Book of Mormon, he felt very much surprised at the assertion, and replied that he had the Bible, which he believed was a revelation from God, and with which he pretended to have some acquaintance; but with respect to the book they had presented him, he must say that he had considerable doubt. Upon this they expressed a desire to investigate the subject, and argue the matter. But he replied, 'No, young gentlemen, you must not argue with me on the subject; but I will read your book and see what

claims it has upon my faith, and will endeavor to ascertain whether it be a revelation from God or not.'"

That evening they held a meeting in the Disciples' chapel. Rigdon was deeply impressed, as were also a great number of his congregation. "The information they had received that evening was of an extraordinary character," said Rigdon in conclusion, "and certainly demanded their most serious consideration. As the apostle advised his brethren to 'prove all things, and hold fast that which was good,' so he would exhort his brethren to do likewise . . . lest they should possibly resist the truth."

For two weeks the Elders continued their labors among the Disciples, and whenever they dropped in on Sidney Rigdon, "they found him very earnestly reading the Book of Mormon—praying to the Lord for direction, and meditating on the things he heard and read." There happened consequently what always happens—what the Book of Mormon promises shall happen * to him

*"Behold I would exhort you that when ye shall read these things, if it be wisdom in God that ye should read them, that . . . . ye would ask God, the eternal Father, in the name of Christ, if these things are not true; and if ye shall ask with a sincere heart, with real intent, having faith in Christ, he will manifest the truth of it unto you, by the power of the Holy Ghost." Moroni, 10: 2-3.

who seeks the truth of Mormonism with undivided soul: he received a testimony direct from God, so that he could exclaim with Peter: "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto me but my Father which is in heaven."

The immediate consequence was, that Rigdon recognized himself as without divine authority; and so both he and his wife were baptized into the church,—perhaps in the early part of December. "In two or three weeks from our arrival in the neighborhood," writes Elder Pratt, "we had baptized one hundred and twenty-seven souls; and this number [under the ministry of Sidney Rigdon, John Murdock, Isaac Morley, Lyman Wight, and Edward Partridge, whom the Elders ordained to carry on the work] soon increased to one thousand."

To the reader who is reluctant to believe that Rigdon's conversion was by a divine testimony, there are certain predisposing circumstances which may yet show that it was honest and genuine, and not feigned for purposes of rascality, as Linn intimates. In the first place, the man who brought the message was a dear friend and confidant. Parley P. Pratt had been sometime a pupil, then a convert, then a fellow-minister in the

Reformed Baptist society, under Rigdon. His words would consequently have peculiar weight.

In the next place, Rigdon had cut loose from sects and creeds, and was ardently contending for the "faith once delivered to the Saints." To him the idea of new revelation would, in consequence, be quite in keeping with the spirit of the scriptures. Why should not man in this day enjoy communion with God by heavenly messengers as did the ancient saints? And when we remember that his conscientiousness compelled him to retire from the ministry in 1824, until such time as he had greater light, it is easy to understand how his heart at once became friendly, and his intellect gave unbiased consideration to the new message.

There was lastly the striking—though very natural—fact that Mormonism offered no essential clash with the elementary tenets of Campbellism. It was not that the Book of Mormon merely paralleled the doctrines which Rigdon, Scott, and Campbell had so admirably drawn from the New Testament: it illumined them, made clear and definite what the Bible left vague, bridged scriptural contradictories, gave infinite perspective to what was fragmentary and disjointed,—in

short, swallowed up the truths of Campbellism as the ocean does the river. Rigdon saw all this with the eye of faith, and it confirmed his testimony; Campbell saw it with the eye of distrust and hatred, and so it served only to embitter him the more.*

As final disproof of Rigdon's authorship of the Book of Mormon, I present herewith passages from a manuscript "Life of Sidney Rigdon," written by his son, John W. Rigdon, and quoted by Roberts in his new History of the Church. The reader should first be informed that Rigdon, failing in his ambition to be President of the Church after the Prophet's death, withdrew from the body of the Saints on their exodus to the Rocky mountains, tried to build up the church anew at Pittsburg, and, failing, retired to Friendship, Alleghany county, New York, where he died in 1876.

*In his "Delusions: an Aanlysis of the Book of Mormon," Campbell says: "He [the author] decides all the great controversies: infant baptism, the Trinity, regeneration, repentance, justification, the fall of man, the atonement, transubstantiation, fasting, penance, church government, the call to the ministry, the general resurrection, eternal punishments, who may baptize, and even the questions of Free masonry, republican government, and the rights of man." In the item of Free masonry, Mr. Campbell's hate spills over a little. For the rest, the list is pretty accurate, but by no means complete.

John W. Rigdon visited Utah in 1863 with a view to studying Mormonism. He was not favorably impressed, and among other things, came to the conclusion that the Book of Mormon itself was a fraud. Accordingly, he determined, on returning home, to sift thoroughly his father's alleged part in getting it up.

"You have been charged with writing that book and giving it to Joseph Smith to introduce to the world. You have always told me one story. . . . . Is this true? If so, all right, if not you owe it to me and to your family to tell it. You are an old man and will soon pass away, and I wish to know if Joseph Smith in your intimacy with him for fourteen years, has not said something to you to lead you to believe that he obtained that book in some other way than what he had told you. . . . My father looked at me a moment, raised his hand above his head and slowly said, with tears glistening in his eyes: 'My son, I can swear before high heaven, that what I have told you about the origin of that book is true. Your mother and sister, Mrs. Athalia Robinson, were present when that book was handed to me in Mentor, Ohio, and all I ever knew about that book was what Parley P. Pratt, Oliver Cowdery, Joseph Smith and the witnesses told me; and in all my intimacy with Joseph Smith, he never told me but the one story . . . and I have never, to you or to any one else, told but the one story, and that I repeat to you.' I believed him, and still believe he told me the truth."

Mr. Rigdon also gives testimony from his mother, just previous to her death, corroborating that of his father, and an affidavit of his sister, Mrs. Athalia Robinson, who was ten years old at the time Rigdon joined the Church, and who testifies to the visit of the Elders and of Parley P. Pratt's handing her father a copy of the Book of Mormon, saying it was a revelation from God. There seems to be really no grounds whatever for connecting Rigdon with the Book of Mormon, save the desperate need of anti-Mormons to account for it somehow in consonance with a fixed notion that Mormonism is a false religion. Needless to say, they are doomed to failure by the Rigdon hypothesis. In the meanwhile, the Book of Mormon is still here, and the field is open for new romancers to try their hand.

CHARACTER OF THE WITNESSES.*

In seeking to vitiate the testimony of the witnesses to the Book of Mormon, Mr. Linn

*The witnesses to the Gold Plates were as follows: (1) the three special witnesses to whom the angel showed them,—Oliver Cowdery, David Whitmer, Martin Harris; (2) the eight witnesses to whom Joseph Smith showed them, —Christian, Jacob, Peter, and John Whitmer, Joseph Smith, Sen., Hyrum Smith, and Samuel H. Smith; (3) the Prophet, his mother, and Mrs. Whitmer, which last I include on the testimony of her son David.

seems guided occasionally more by hate than by craftiness. Instead of discriminating with the judgment of a lawyer, in his choice of slander, throwing out that which manifestly defeats itself, he lays it all on, no matter how or by whom it is brought. His question is not: Is this effective mud? only: Is it mud?

Five of the fourteen witnesses who beheld the Plates were directly of the Smith family; viz., the Prophet, his father and mother, and his brothers Hyrum and Samuel. In order to discredit these, Linn prepared the way, as we have seen, by quoting liberally from the slanders which Hurlbut the apostate gathered against the whole family, and which Howe published and fathered; slanders of which, aside from their disproof in the first number of this magazine, it is sufficient to say that Hurlbut collected them. Against the Prophet himself Linn brings stories which, to say the least, discredits his judgment as a historian.

No particular is more common, for instance, in the fabulous accounts of treasure buried by the buccaneers, than that it is guarded by bloody wraith or ghost of sailor murdered for that purpose. This very cheap and conventional explanation, Mr.

Linn finds among the early inventions attributed to Joseph Smith. He quotes from a letter written by Hiel and Joseph Lewis of Harmony in 1879, fifty years after the event, to James T. Cobb of Salt Lake City.

"This statement, in effect, was that he [Joseph] dreamed of an iron box containing gold plates curiously engraved which he must translate into a book; that twice when he attempted to secure the plates he was knocked down, and when he asked why he could not have them, 'he saw a man standing over the spot who, to him, appeared like a Spaniard, having a long beard down over his breast with his throat cut from ear to ear and the blood streaming down, who told him that he could not get it alone.' He then narrated how he got the box in company with Emma. 'In all this narrative there was not one word about visions of God, or of angels, or heavenly revelations; all his information was by that dream and that bleeding ghost. The heavenly visions and messages of angels, etc., contained in the Mormon books were after-thoughts, revised to order."

Mr. Linn actually credits this story, as will be indicated by the following comment:

"We may now contrast these early accounts of the disclosure with the version given in the Prophet's autobiography (written, be it remembered, in Nauvoo in 1838), the one accepted by all orthodox Mormons. One of its striking features will be found to be the transformation of the Spaniard—with-his-throat-cut into a messenger from heaven."

That is to say, Mr. Linn would have the reader believe that not until Sidney Rigdon came into the Church to shape and unify its teachings, did the story of the Book of Mor-

mon take its present form. It is in such suggestions that Linn shows the weakness of pure malevolence. Could the Prophet's parents and brothers and sisters and the Whitmers have been made to give up Presbyterianism and join the new Church, with such a tale? There were at least ninety souls baptized before Sidney Rigdon came into the Church. Were these converted by a "bloody ghost" story? The simple fact is that from the date of his first vision in 1820, and continuously thereafter, the Prophet told one consistent, undeviating story—a fact which contemporaneous records abundantly prove. Under no other circumstances could he have made converts of people intimately acquainted with all the secrets of his life. Another example of the depths of fatuity into which hate led this judicial(!) historian is a reproduction of the following affidavit from the Hurlbut-Howe collection. Comment is unnecessary:

"One day he came and greeted me with joyful countenance [so one Ingersoll is made to say]. Upon asking the cause of his unusual happiness, he replied in the following language: 'As I was passing yesterday across the woods, after a heavy shower of rain, I found in a hollow some beautiful white sand that had been washed up by the water. I took off my frock and tied up several quarts of it, and then went home. At that moment I happened to think about a history found in Canada, called a

Golden Bible; so I very gravely told them it was the Golden Bible. To my surprise they were credulous enough to believe what I said. Accordingly I told them I had received a commandment to let no one see it, for, says I, no man can see it with the natural eye and live. However, I offered to take out the book and show it to them, but they refused to see it and left the room. Now,' said Joe, 'I've got the d—d fools fixed, and will carry out the fun.'"

Respecting the witnesses to whom the Angel Moroni showed the Plates, Mr. Linn has this to say: "Surely if any three men in the Church should remain steadfast, mighty pillars of support for the Prophet in his future troubles, it should be these chosen witnesses to the actual existence of the Golden Plates. Yet every one of them became an apostate, and every one of them was loaded with all the opprobrium that the Church could pile upon him."

Yet had they remained faithful to the Church, what would have been Mr. Linn's comment? Would he not have said: "Of course; could you expect anything else from men who consented to remain the tools of an unscrupulous hierarchy? These men have everything to gain and nothing to lose by maintaining their false testimony!" Clearly, so far as the existence of the Plates is concerned, the evidence could not be made stronger than by their turning away from the Church and still remaining true, as

they did, to their testimony. The temptation to injure the Church by recanting, must, at a certain period in the life of each, have been very strong; yet the conviction that they had actually seen and handled the plates remained stronger still.*

Let us now look into the source of this undeviating conviction. Our first enquiry is in relation to what made it so strong.

After receiving the Plates, September 22, 1827, Joseph Smith, was compelled to leave Manchester, New York, on account of repeated attempts to steal them,—Martin Harris having given him fifty dollars by the assistance of which he reached Harmony, Pennsylvania. Here in December he copied and translated some of the characters, which Mr. Harris in February, 1828, took to Professor Anthon in New York. The necessity of making a living prevented the Prophet

*Linn's efforts at breaking down their testimony is rather lame. He cites a violent tirade against Oliver Cowdery's wickedness by Sidney Rigdon, and the fact that Martin Harris is called a "wicked man" in one of the revelations. Against David Whitmer, he can find nothing; though he might have quoted the testimony of twenty-one leading citizens of Richmond, Mo., most of them civil officers, that he was a "man of the highest integrity, and of undoubted truth and veracity." Harris and Cowdery repented of the vanity and rashness which led them out of the Church, and in deepest humility came back to the fold before their death.

from doing more, until April 12, when the work of translation began in earnest, and lasted till June 14, Harris acting as scribe. The result was one hundred and sixteen pages of foolscap manuscript, which Martin was permitted to take home as a means of convincing his wife, and which was stolen from him, and never recovered.

Through sheer need of having to work for bread, and also because of being without a scribe, Joseph did not resume the translation till April 5, 1829, when Oliver Cowdery became his scribe. The work continued under this arrangement till the following June, Joseph dictating, and Oliver recording. The timely arrival, at this stage, of David Whitmer, generously offering to board and lodge them at his father's home in Fayette, N. Y., while the work was going on, prevented another lay off, and so the translation was completed by the beginning of July, 1829.

"I, as well as all of my father's family," writes an interviewer of David Whitmer in the Kansas City Journal, June 5, 1881, "Smith's wife, Oliver Cowdery, and Martin Harris, were present during the translation. The translation was by Smith and the manner was as follows: He had two small stones of a chocolate color, nearly egg-shape, and perfectly smooth, but not transparent, called interpreters, which were given him with the plates. He did not use the plates in the translation, but would hold the

interpreters to his eyes, and cover his face with a hat, excluding all light, and before his eyes would appear what seemed to be parchment, on which would appear the characters of the plates in a line at the top and immediately below would appear the translation in English, which Smith would read to his scribe, who wrote it down as it fell from his lips. The scribe would then read the sentence written and if any mistake had been made, the characters would remain visible to Smith until corrected, when they faded from sight to be replaced by another line"*

Consider now the bearing of the facts before us. Here were nine of the fourteen witnesses—eight beside the prophet; viz, the five Whitmer boys, their mother, Martin Harris, and Oliver Cowdery,—listening day after day, *for a month,* to the story of the Book of Mormon as it grew under the dictation of a young man with his face buried in a hat. Talk about Rigdon or any one else furnishing the manuscript! There was absolutely no room here for chicanery. Joseph Smith either composed the Book of Mormon out-right, or it was revealed to him,

*Joseph Smith has not, to my knowledge, left any explanation of the modus operandi of translating. The above must therefore be taken with the usual allowance for the personal equation of the reporter,—especially in that detail about the parchment with its double series of characters. Martin Harris confirms the report in part: "By aid of the seer stone [the Prophet seems to have used the seer stone and the Urim and Thummim interchangeably], sentences would appear . . . . and if correctly written, would disapepar, ... if not it would remain until corrected."

sentence by sentence, as he says. Cowdery and Harris had each sat listening and writing for three months under similar circumstances. How could experience be more exacting,—more likely to produce a conviction which nothing afterward in life could efface?

The only question now was the actual seeing of the Plates—the original of that which they had listened to for months. "It was in June, 1829, the latter part of the month," says David Whitmer, referring to the time when the three witnesses saw the Plates, "and the eight witnesses saw them the next day or the day afterward. Joseph showed them the plates himself, but the Angel showed us [the three witnesses] the plates, as I suppose to fulfil the words of the book itself. Martin Harris was not with us at this time; he obtained a view of them afterwards, the same day."

"Joseph, Oliver and myself," continues David Whitmer, "were together when I saw them. We not only saw the plates of the Book of Mormon, but also the brass plates, the plates of the Book of Ether, the plates containing the records of the wickedness and the secret combinations of the people of the world down to the time of their being engraved, and many other plates. The fact is, it was just as though Joseph, Oliver and I were sitting just here on a log, when we were overshadowed by a light. It was not like the light of the sun, nor like that of a fire, but more beautiful. It extended away around

us, I cannot tell how far, but in the midst of this light about as far off as he sits, (pointing to John C. Whitmer sitting a few feet from him), there appeared, as it were, a table with many records or plates upon it, besides the plates of the Book of Mormon, also the sword of Laban, the directors (i. e. the ball which Lehi had) and the interpreters. I saw them just as plainly as I see this bed (striking the bed beside him with his hand), and I heard the voice of the Lord, as distinctly as I have ever heard anything in my life, declaring that the records of the plates were translated by the gift and power of God."

Reverting, then, to my purpose in reciting these facts, I may remark that the events observed by the Three Witnesses, from the inception of the translation to the culmination set forth in the above extract, were so palpable, that they could neither deny nor forget them. It remained only that they be honest men to account for their undeviating testimony, even when they themselves fell from grace. As evidence corroborative of the story told by the Three Witnesses, I quote the recollections of Lucy Smith, mother of the Prophet, respecting the occurrences of that remarkable day.

"When they [the witnesses] returned to the house, it was between three and four o'clock p. m. Mrs. Whitmer, Mr. Smith and myself were sitting in the bed room at the time. On coming in, Joseph threw himself down beside me, and exclaimed: 'Father, mother, you do not know how happy I am; the Lord has caused the Plates to be shown to three more besides myself. They have seen an angel, who has testified to them, and they will have to bear wit-

ness to the truth of what I have said, for now they know for themselves that I do not go about to deceive the people, and I feel as if I was relieved of a burden which was almost too heavy for me to bear, and it rejoices my soul that I am not any longer to be entirely alone in the world.' Upon this Martin Harris came in. He seemed almost overcome with joy, and testified boldly to what he had both seen and heard. And so did David and Oliver, adding that no tongue could express the joy of their hearts and the greatness of the things which they had both seen and heard."

The attempt to show that the witnesses could be mistaken fails from the simple nature, and the long-continued observation, of the facts involved; the attempt to break down their veracity is equally futile; they were honest men, though subject to temptations and sin like other mortals. Account for them as you may, the facts concerning the coming forth of the Book of Mormon are still there, and the world must face them squarely; for they can neither be ignored nor explained away.

"In an historical inquiry of this kind," remarks Linn, when confronted with the meager and contradictory data to support his theory of Rigdon's authorship of the Book of Mormon, "it is more important to establish the fact that a certain thing *was done* than to prove just *how* or *when* it was done." If this maxim holds water for Linn, it ought also to do so for me. The thing

here absolutely established as "done," was the dictation of the Book of Mormon by Joseph Smith, the while his eyes were covered in the darkness of a hat. The "when" is equally established beyond controversy. The "how" admits of the alternatives I have pointed out. Either Joseph Smith recited from memory or invented outright the 350,000 words composing the record, or he received assistance from some supernatural source.

The memorizing hypothesis may be dismissed at once; for if we could suppose such a feat possible for a raw, unlettered youth, there would yet be the problem of escaping detection while in the act of coaching himself, with a score of sceptical eyes watching his every movement. As to his invention of the book, no one who has read it will hold that view a moment. The difficulty was no whit less than would be the invention of the Bible outright; and so that hypothesis also may be laid down. There remains then only the last alternative: the Book of Mormon was revealed to him. The positive evidence of this fact I have set forth in part; the difficulties in the way of accepting it, are considered in the leading article of this number.

THE MORMON POINT OF VIEW.

A Quarterly Magazine, owned and edited by N. L. Nelson, Professor of English, Brigham Young University. Price, $1.00 a year; single copies, 40c. Entered in the Postoffice at Provo City, Utah, as second-class matter.

Vol. I. Provo City, Utah, July 1, 1904. No. 3.

"LEARN TO READ UP HILL"

A favorite piece of advice by President Brimhall to students who desire to know how best to continue the intellectual life after they leave school, is that which I have made the caption of this short article. "Read up-hill, young man, if you want to keep growing."

Of course the young man ponders often and deeply before he fathoms the full significance of this peculiarly forceful metaphor. Read up-hill,—that is something he cannot do, if he read only the newspaper. At best he is reading along the dead level, with many a moral slough and social quagmire to cross. He gains nothing in mental vigor, because there are no mental lifts for him to make; or if there are, they bore him, such is the vitiating tendency of skimming for mere surface interest, and of moving from point to point, butterfly-like, before the mind has time to get down to underlying principles.

Nor are the contents of a newspaper to be swallowed entire, any more than the wares in a green grocer's market. They are to be selected, prepared, served to taste, chewed, and digested, if they are to build up the intellectual life. The man who feeds indiscriminately on the columns of a daily paper is the man who throws down the gates of his individuality and makes of his mind a common road for all the moving things of earth. His only reward, if reward it can be called, is to stand passively by gaping at the motley procession, while it tramps into the ground the choice private gardens of his soul.

"Read up-hill, young man." This no man can do, if every new accession to his library be a novel. Barring a few great works of fiction which are analytical studies of the soul, it is safe to say that reading novels is reading down-hill; it is a relaxing of mental tension, without which there can be no growth of mind-power, and sliding down the incline of morbid sentiment to shadowy plains of unreality where even feeling itself becomes colorless.

The habitual novel-reader is a mental dyspeptic, whose appetite is tempted only by literary caramels and strongly seasoned newspaper hash. There is really no easier way to get into the comfortable circle of mental mediocrity than to become a devotee of popular fiction. No ambition disturbs you, save the desire to shine in parlor par-

ties, and you acquire a mental calibre best described as the "smooth bore" a calibre well fitted for bird shot and other small ideas of that kind, which may be fired without accuracy of aim, and mainly for the noise and smoke.

The school that does not engraft the habit of reading up-hill has failed to reach the inner life of the student; failed to create that "hunger and thirst after righteousness," —that insatiable craving to fathom the meaning and trend of life—which is ever a prerequisite to being "blessed." On the other hand, he in whom this hunger and thirst have been created, has little further need of the school: books are his college, and the world itself his university. No fear that library trash will detain him; for reading on the dead level bores him, while reading down-hill nauseates. His pleasure consists in the effort necessary to climb, quite as much as in the exhilaration which always follows from looking at life from a higher point of view.

And he shall be further blessed; for before him rise the shining heights where dwell apart the spirits of Shakespeare and Milton, Paul and the Beloved Disciple—all the masters of deep thought and classic expression; and these he shall associate with, not in the vulgar fashion which, because it appreciates little, finds it necessary to boast much, but in the true communion of soul with soul,—too sacred a relationship to

dress up vanity in. Moreover, he shall in time be blessed with discernment of spirits; so that before he shall read a hundred lines, he shall be able to judge unerringly whether his author be a thought artist or merely a literary tailor.

Reading up-hill involves two things: reading the right kind of books, and reading them in the proper way. As to the first, this rule may be set down as infallible: Only such books are wholesome as tend to help us understand, appreciate, and react by truth relations upon, our environments; all others are false and pernicious, however charming they may seem. Let the reader take up book by book in his library and square its contents with this principle,—taking care to include under environments all the *real* forces, spiritual or otherwise, which play upon his soul,—and then agree or disagree with me. Space compels me to drop the question here.

As to reading in the right way, I shall touch upon only one aspect, that of making constant use of a dictionary. Has it ever occurred to the reader that perfect thought-communication is possible only where giver and receiver hold in common, thought symbols—that is to say, words—of exactly the same signification? But how rarely is this the case! And to the extent that our words have different weight, color, or psychic associations, to that extent we fail to give or receive the equivalent of other men's thoughts and ideas.

If now every man and woman had access to a thought bank,—a sort of clearing house for thought-symbols,—where his words could be reweighed and stamped anew with their just and true signification, then we should gradually get rid of our misunderstandings, and come to a delightful sense of intellectual unity. Such a bank is any good standard dictionary—that priceless repository of accurate ideas, that peerless peace-maker among the war of words. Let the farmer sell his last cow, if need be, to place this golden key to the world's treasures of literature,—this unerring guide in the world's wilderness of books —into the hands of his growing son or daughter.

And let them use it incessantly. The fact that it is absent in nine-tenths of the homes of Latter-day Saints* has resulted in a popular vocabulary among us, which, measured by the canons of a pure diction, must be characterized as slip-shod and wishy-washy. But the worst fault induced by its deplorable absence, is the vicious habit of guessing at the meaning of words, or being content to miss the force of an entire passage, because it does not yield to the first mental effort.

* I refer to dictionaries of the type of Webster's International. The statement would be true, I believe, even if I should come down to the next size, the Academic or Student's dictionary—a most lamentable fact. Primary school dictionaries are of little worth in researches above the district school level of ideas.

Think how our gardens would look, if they were weeded on this plan; our parlors, if they were swept by such a rule; our farms, if they were cultivated on this shabby principle! But then, getting vague and misty meanings to words merely cripples the soul—a worthless appurtenance compared with those other things, to which we devote such care and accuracy!

Let me come now directly to my own grievance. Word reaches me from various sources that my magazine is too "deep," my ideas expresed in phraseology too difficult, for the ordinary reader. I grieve to think that there may be much truth in this complaint; but I grieve for the "ordinary reader," not for the writer. The latter I have in hand, and know how it sometimes takes hours and hours of intensest thought to get even a few short paragraphs into logical sequence and graphic form. Then when I look them over, and see the unusual words here and there, I think of the 'ordinary reader' and his pitiful mental indolence. If I can throw in a suggestive phrase to help him, I do so, knowing his reluctance to go to the dictionary; but I cannot and will not reduce the whole thing down to thin soup once more, to suit his watery mental digestion. I let it go, in the hope that it may prove a tonic to his undisciplined mind.

To take an instance in point, read this sentence from the last number, page 151:

"The reader will probably agree with me, then, that looked at from the human point of view, the *untrammeled* mind of Joseph Smith was a better medium for God's purposed *iconoclasm,* than would have been the mind of any other man with a hundred times the mental polish, yet lacking the necessary *plasticity.*"

Don't imagine that I didn't look twice at the words I have put in italics, and measure the distress they were likely to occasion in the "ordinary reader." But there was no help for it. The sentence was a swift summing up of a course of reasoning, and ought to carry its meaning, if only by suggestion. Then the thought came: Perhaps a reader here and there will go to the dictionary, and how richly he will be rewarded by the mind-play which must come to him; e. g: *Iconoclasm*: the breaking of images. *Iconoclast*: a breaker or destroyer of images or idols ["Abraham," flashes into the mind]; a determined enemy of idol worship. *God's purposed iconoclasm!* "Oh, I see,—the 'stone cut out of the mountain without hand' that shall break in pieces all the kingdoms of the earth"—and so on.

All this fine imagery comes by suggestion to the reader who is *determined* to fathom the meaning of words; and the peculiarity of the pleasure resulting therefrom, lies in the fact that the reader recognizes it as having been created by his own mind rather

than by that of the author; whence the truth of the aphorism that the real pleasure of classic literature lies between the lines.

It would be much easier to write so as to say it all—in the loose, padded style of the newspaper. The real work of the author lies in three things; first, the selection of just those aspects which lend themselves to unity; secondly, the compression of his matter to the smallest compass; and thirdly, the choice of such imagery as shall tell by suggestion all that has been left out.

The compression results in unusual words and suggestive, though sometimes difficult, imagery; as for instance: "Were not all the Bible prophets, with the single exception of Paul, of the same type as Joseph Smith? Men whose greatness lay solely in the fact that their souls were *prisms* through which the *white light* of infinite truth was *differentiated* into the *myriad hued* duties and obligations of social life; duties and obligations the daily reactions from which bring man nearer to God."

Let the "ordinary reader" spend an hour working out the remote bearings of this expression, and begin to feel the joy of thinking with his author,—an operation new to his passive mind,—and he will get some idea of what it means to read up hill.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE.

CHRIST'S MERCILESS TEST OF FAITH.

What is the meaning of the spiritual life? How is it engendered? What are its manifestations? Are the characteristics of the spiritual life distinct enough for scientific study? How is the spiritual life related to the natural life? Are the two forms of life potentially co-existent? If so, are they reciprocal functions of the great mystery of life itself, or are they mutually exclusive? In other words, Can a man remain all that is implied by the words "natural life" the while he is cultivating the life divine; or must the natural life wane and die in proportion as the spiritual life attains ascendency? These and a hundred other questions that will arise as this discussion proceeds, ought at once to challenge the interest of the reader.

Let us go back to one of the most dramatic scenes in the life of our Savior. He had just fed the multitude, and such had been the effect of his miraculous multiplication of the loaves and fishes, that these men said to one another: "Of a truth this is that Prophet which should come into the world."

But when Jesus perceived that they were about to take him by force and proclaim him king, he departed alone into a mountain. All that night and the next day the people sought for him, such was the growing enthusiasm to place him on the throne of David. Who can doubt for a moment, that had he manifested the least trace of the demagogue, had he even been passive 'in the hands of his friends,' the movement would eventually have swept the whole Jewish nation into a revolt against the Romans? Yet note now with what a merciless hand he denies himself all this homage, causing his last adherent to desert him, and even his disciples to hesitate about following him further.

"Ye seek me," said he to the multitude, next day, "not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled. Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life."

In these words is found the key to the situation. The "meat which perisheth" stands for the natural life with all its ambitions and achievements. Christ perceived that this popular uprising had really no other source. At the same time, he knew that the kingdom of which he was to be king, had no room for

a single subject of that kind. "Seek rather the meat which endureth to everlasting life." The spiritual side of their natures had not yet been awakened. They were still of the earth, earthy, in all their aspirations.

"What sign shewest thou then that we may see and believe thee?" they asked him. "What dost thou work?" Then they reminded him that Moses gave their forefathers manna in the desert. The Savior seizing upon the allusion, told them that this food ministered only to the physical appetite, leaving the soul untouched: "Moses gave you not that bread from heaven.....Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead."

Here then was another type of the natural life, the life which, like the grasses, today is but tomorrow is not; and once more does Christ set in contrast with it the life that is eternal: "Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven ..... This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and never die."

"Lord," cried they with the eagerness of new converts, "evermore give us this bread." But when he put the condition un-

der which they might obtain it, they were staggered: *"I am that bread of life.. . .* He that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." At this the Jews murmured saying, "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?" "Murmur not among yourselves," replied the Savior. "No man *can* come unto me except the Father draw him.....All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me will I in no wise cast out."

What then is the meaning of the expression, the "Father draw him," and the "Father giveth him?" Nothing else than the awakening in man of the spiritual life; a psychic operation possible only to God. How many in this vast multitude had thus been "drawn" or "given" by the divine hand? All would follow him on the basis of the natural life; how many would respond on the basis of the spiritual? He proceeds to put the test:

"I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread he shall live forever: and the bread that I will give *is my flesh,* which I will give for the life of the world." Up till this point his audience had merely been non-plussed

by his teachings; now they strove among themselves saying, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?"

But Christ did not enlighten them: he merely emphasized the strange doctrine by repeating, "Verily, verily I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by my Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven; not as your fathers did eat manna and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live forever."

Such was Christ's doctrine of the spiritual life; such the fearlessness with which he challenged men's souls. Is it any wonder that the people slunk away? Even his professed disciples said, "This is a hard saying; who can hear it? And many from that time went back and walked no more with him."

There is something pathetic in the attitude of the twelve. His words had been in-

comprehensible to them and they stood overwhelmed with doubt. Nevertheless, to the Savior's questions, "Will ye also go away?" Simon Peter answered: "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God."

Does the reader comprehend how Christ is the bread of life? How none can eat "this bread," save as the Father draw him? How unless he eat this bread—unless he eat Christ's flesh and drink Christ's blood—there is no eternal life in him?

Blessed are they who, like the twelve disciples, can believe this doctrine of the spiritual life, even without knowing its implications, simply because they love and trust Him who proclaims it. Are you among that number? Or are you still one of the multitude that would go away again under similar circumstances? Let us proceed reverently and prayerfully to think out the meaning of Christ's words.

II.

VARIOUS EXPRESSIONS OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE.

Nothing perhaps will better tend to clear the way for this subject, than to consider the various aspects in which the spiritual life is spoken of in scripture. The most familiar and oft-quoted aspect is that of spiritual birth. "Except a man be born of the water *and of the spirit,* he cannot enter the kingdom of God." And then as if to contrast the natural with the spiritual life, the Savior adds: "that which is born of the flesh, is flesh; that which is born of the spirit, is spirit."*

Here are a number of other statements of this aspect: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently; *being born again,* not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." † "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot commit sin, because he is born of God."‡ "Beloved, let us love one another:

*John 3: 5, 6. †I. Peter 1: 22, 23. ‡I. John 3: 9.

for love is of God: and every one that loveth *is born of God,* and knoweth God."§

Note that in all these passages, and in others that might be quoted, not only is the fact of the spiritual life characterized as by a new birth, but its chief manifestation, love, is invariably pointed out.

The idea of the spiritual life is also couched in many passages under the aspect of coming unto Christ or coming unto God. "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink." "He that cometh unto God must first believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." "And the spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come: and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." In these passages the spiritual life is described not by the manner of its inception, nor by its manifestations towards others, but by the goal towards which it causes man to aspire. That goal is none other than God himself; a fact which Christ comprehended when he said to his disciples, "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect."

Paul has a most vivid conception of the

§I. John 4: 7.

two states of the soul: "They that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally-minded [i. e. to be living the natural life] is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace . . . but ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you."‖ So in another place he says: "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth."¶ And of Sardis, one of the seven churches mentioned in Revelations, a church which had become worldly again, the Spirit said: "I know thy works, that thou hast a name thou livest and art dead. Be watchful and strengthen the things which remain, and are ready to die."* John describes the transition from the natural to the spiritual life in the same way: "We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren."†

We come now to the strangest of all the characterizations of the spiritual life, that in which it is represented as being Christ himself. "He that hath the Son hath life. And he that hath not the Son hath not life," says John.‡ "Know ye not," asks Paul, "how

‖ Rom. 8: 5-7. ¶ I. Timothy, 5: 6. *Revelations, 3: 1, 2. † I. John, 3: 14. ‡ I. John, 5: 12.

that *Jesus Christ is in you,* except ye be reprobates?"§ Again: "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?"‖ "My little children," he writes affectionately to the Galatians, "of whom I have travail in birth, *till Christ be formed in you.*" "I am crucified with Christ," says Paul again, "nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

The key to Paul's strong metonymies is found in First Corinthians 6:19, where he restates the question, "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?" in these words: "What! know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you, and which ye have of God?" If therefore for "Christ" in the passages above quoted, we read "the Holy Ghost as charged with the mind and will of Christ," all ambiguities disappear.

So also in no other way than this can we understand Christ's own strong words: "At that day ye shall know that I am in the Father and ye in me, and I in you."* Taken literally such a thing would be impossible; but if we understand it figuratively, all difficulty vanishes. The passage probably means

§ II. Cor., 15: 5. ‖ I. Cor., 6: 15.

that the Holy Ghost, charged with Christ's mind and will, is to be in man, and man's mind and will, conveyed by the Holy Ghost, is to be in Christ; even as now the mind and will of the Father is in Christ, and Christ's mind and will is in the Father, through the same sacred medium.

The development of the spiritual life is set forth in still another aspect by our Savior. The Pharisees had demanded of him when the kingdom of God should come and this is his answer: "The kingdom of God cometh not with outward show: neither shall they say, Lo here, or Lo there, for the kingdom of God is within you." Here the well known figure of metonymy is used, the effect being spoken of instead of the cause. That change, that regeneration, which fits a man for the kingdom of God, comes to him "without observation" or "without outward show" as the marginal reference has it. Its approach cannot be heralded by a trumpet. It is a something born within him.

¶ Gal., 4: 19. *John, 14: 10.

III.

WHAT THESE VARIOUS ASPECTS MEAN.

All these methods of conceiving the spiritual life are strongly figurative, like nearly all oriental thought. Let us briefly review them in order to realize better their force and bearing.

First there is the significant imagery surrounding the birth conception. This implies first the engendering of a new life without ostentation and deep in the soul's womb of truth. Next there is the coming forth of this life into a new world; innocent, pure, and fraught with the potentialities of endless evolution. This "being born of the Spirit" represents the expression side, as "being conceived of the spirit" represents the impression side of the life divine. Other analogies,—such for instance as the mutual obligations between God and man as between parent and child, and the possibility of the child attaining to the full stature of the parent,—will occur to the reader by a little reflection.

There is next the figure involved in "coming unto God." "All ye that labor and are heavy-laden, come unto me, and I will give

you rest;" and "If any man thirst let him come to me and drink," are both figures which would be very effective in a country where fatigue and thirst are daily experiences. The deeper significance, however, seems to be that while the natural life meets with obstructions on all sides,—known as hunger, thirst, sickness, sorrow, death,—because it is out of harmony with law, the spiritual life,—being nothing more nor less than perfect adjustment to law,—encounters friction with the universe only to the extent that it is yet imperfect.

"Consider the lilies of the field," said the Master, "they toil not neither do they spin, yet Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these." The natural, organic, frictionless evolution of the lily, is a fine type of the spiritual life in its relation to the universe; the labored, aritifical nailed-together pomp and circumstance of Solomon, stands equally for the natural life. So also when Christ said to the multitude, "He that eateth this bread shall live forever," and to the woman of Samaria, "The water I give shall be a well springing up unto everlasting life," he pointed out by other figures that "coming unto God" is a process of eliminating friction with law by obeying

law; a process of coming into harmony with the universe.

Consider next the many references in scripture to the natural life as something dead, and to the spiritual life as this same something made alive. At first sound we are inclined to think of the word 'dead' as something that has ceased to live. But Paul evidently used the word in the sense of 'dormant,' or that which has not yet begun to live.

There is a tremendous difference between the two conceptions: the same difference as that which subsists between an acorn, which has not yet begun to be an oak, and a heap of ashes, which recently was an oak. Yet potentially these two extremes are alike; should the acorn fail to become an oak, it will not be long till it will be indistinguishable from the ashes.

It is in this sense only that the natural man is dead; for hidden in every soul born to earth, like the oak in the acorn, is the potentiality of eternal life. But should this potentiality never became dynamic,—should the spirual life never be awakened—then he is dead indeed; for nothing else than the spiritual can come into eternal harmony with the universe. What difference, when both

become mould, which was acorn and which was ashes? "He that hath the Son, hath life; and he that hath not the Son hath not life." This is merely the scriptural statement of the acorn that became an oak, or failing to do so, became ashes.

¶ Respecting the next figure, that Christ is our spiritual life,—that to become spiritually alive is to have "Christ formed within us,"—I cannot say much here, as the explication of this thought forms the central fact of my thesis. However, it may be well to clear up the notion of what is meant when we use the word Christ.

To nine people out of ten the word brings into mind the man Jesus, whereas the idea Christ does not stand for any personality whatever. It is confusing even to say that Christ is Messiah or Savior: we think still of the man. Christ is Messiah-hood or Savior-hood, if the reader will pardon so violent a coinage. Christ is the *power that saves*—the power delegated by God to save mankind.

When we speak of Christ as the "anointed one," we must understand that it is the *"anointing,"* not the "one," which is Christ. Call this anointing by what name you will,—priesthood, Godhood, eternal kingship,—

it is that power in the universe which can save—the power that can awaken the dormant spiritual life, and gradually attune the soul to harmony with the universe.

¶ True enough, this power could never have become operative save as it was clothed upon the man Jesus [or some other being, should he have failed]; no more than could the abstract but very real power known as the presidency of the United States, accomplish things without an executive being to wield it.

On the other hand, the man Jesus, stripped of this delegated power and authority, might still have influenced the world in the way that Buddha, Socrates, or Confucius did; but he could no more have been Savior,—he could no more have awakened in man the spirtual life,—than you or I. Do not misunderstand me: his personality was such that he could perhaps have done a million-fold more than you or I *in preparing men to permit God to light their torches of eternal life.* But even though this power,—of awakening faith in God and a desire to be saved,—were multiplied a million-million fold, he would still not be Messiah or Savior; for unless God touched the hearts of the converts made by him, kindling within them the

life eternal, they would remain still in the life natural.

If now we remember that Christ is always to be thought of as Christhood, or that part of Godhead whose special function is to save mankind,—let the method be what it may,—we shall have no difficulty in understanding how Christ may be "formed within us," and how "he that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life."

Let us lastly consider the characterization of the spiritual life as the "Kingdom of God" within the heart of man. In its literal sense the Kingdom of God involves a perfect social organism,—something man has not yet power to conceive, let alone form and perpetuate. The main lines of this perfected society are, however, foreshadowed in the Church. Beginning with the family as the social unit and building progressively upward through the ward, the stake, and so on, to a wider and wider generalization of power, we come at last to Jesus Christ, the King of kings; every part being so perfectly coördinated and subordinated that we shall have a social structure which is the natural expression of truth, and which, therefore, cannot fail to bear fruits of love, joy, peace,

and those other virtues involved in perfect bliss.

Yet all this social evolution, Christ says, is in our hearts. How? Just as an oak tree is in the acorn; or as the forest to be, is hidden away in the seed that is. Just as the kingdom of God is the perfect expression of the collective spiritual life of His children, so the potentiality of that kingdom—the seed, as it were—must even now lie dormant within us. How shall it be awakened? How shall we enter the holy of holies in our own hearts and commune with the author of eternal life? That is a question belonging to my next chapter.

Here we shall do well to contrast these figurative aspects of the spiritual life,—the "*birth of the spirit,*" the "coming unto God," the "passing from death unto life," "having Christ formed within us," and the "Kingdom of God in the human heart,"—with the simple, literal expression of the same truth in Peter's words: "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins and *ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*" It is through this medium that God sets free the spiritual life in man, even as a sunbeam awakens the oak slumbering in the acorn.

All those other ways of saying it—those figurative conceptions—are only partial descriptions of the changes that take place in the soul under the regenerating warmth of this potent influence.

It remains only to point out that we of this day have reached a prosaic level in the history of the world. The same heavenly power which made Paul and his fellow-missionaries break into poetic ecstasies of expression, in trying to convey to others what they felt, now leads us to say simply, but still fervently: "We have a testimony of the Gospel: we know that this work is from God."

IV.

"EXCEPT MY FATHER DRAW HIM."

"Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me except it were given him of my Father."—Jesus.

At the close of the chapter recounting Peter's Pentecostal sermon occurs this sentence: "And the Lord added to the Church daily *such as should be saved.*" This passage, so full of profound truth when rightly understood, has been of untold mischief to

the religious conceptions of mankind. Examine the words carefully: "And the Lord added"—as if salvation or damnation lay absolutely in his will; "such as should be saved,"—implying that there were others predestined not to be saved. I repeat, the misinterpretation of these words has been the source of a spiritual blight to the world, which is only another way of saying that on this and a few similar texts rests the doctrine of predestination, which assumes that men and women are elected to heaven or hell by no act or merit of their own, but solely according to the caprice of the Almighty.

One of these passages we have already examined. When Christ was confronted with a multitude of people enthusiastic to make him king, He did not hesitate to put the test that should determine whether they were acting on the basis of the natural or of the spiritul life; for, said He, "No man *can* come unto me unless the Father draw him." Nor was he afraid that the test he was about to apply would discourage any that were really fitted to come. "All that the Father giveth me," said he, "shall come unto me: and him that cometh to me I will in nowise cast out." The result proved that none of the multitude had "been given" by the

Father, and not many of his professed disciples.

What then? Shall man sit expectantly or indifferently by, till it becomes God's pleasure to "draw him" or "give him" to Christ? Somehow, these passages must be understood in consonance with the universal invitation: "Let him who is athirst come; and whosoever will, let him take the waters of life freely."* The appeal here is to man's volition, not to God's permission. It is "whosoever will," not "whosoever God wills." The problem is to reconcile these apparently conflicting ideas.

And this problem is easy enough to one who steadily refuses to think mystery into it. Of course ultimately, and in the absolute sense, man is dependent upon God for the breath that keeps him alive, for the water and food that nourish him, and for all those adjustments of nature whose sum-total constitute his tenure of mortal existence; but behind all this, man has a will no less free than his Father's; and should there be a trial as to which is supreme, God could of course, deprive him successively of all the powers that have been added upon him by

*Revelations, 22: 17.

virtue of obedience, since the birth of his spirit in heaven, provided eternal justice permitted such an undoing of man. But man's will might still hold out negatively—even to a point where nothing in the universe could touch it further.

Of course such a state would represent our extreme idea of damnation—a state in which there would be left to him the consciousness to know and feel, but no vestige of power to do, unless ability to refuse assent to God, be considered power, and this nothing could take away. It would be such a state, in fact, as Lucifer the arch rebel is even now approaching. In the positive sense, therefore—that is, as respects power to create, modify, change,—God's will must ever be supreme over man's; but in the negative sense they are, ever have been, and ever must be equal.

This view of the human will must become clear with a little thought.

Make man co-eternal with God, as Joseph Smith does, and you cannot escape the necessity of endowing him with free will; but free will is not free will, if it have any limitation; if on the negative side it could ultimately be crushed through coercion, or if on the positive side there were any degree

of power to which it might not attain, should it comply with the conditions.

In the light of this doctrine, it must be self-evident that man never has attained nor ever can attain, to any saving attribute or spiritual power, save by an act of will on his own part. What I mean is, God could not elect that man should be blessed so or so simply to please Himself; any more than He could decree that man should be damned so or so without reference to eternal justice. Man can be blessed only if he consent to God's will; he can be damned only if he defy God's will. In other words, man's promotion or demotion in the scale of progress is directly related to his own will, and not predetermined by God.

But man wills only because he desires. It is here then, here in the field of desire, the field antecedent to will, that all the forces of the universe—usually summed up in the word, environment,—play upon him. It is here, therefore, and here only, that God's love finds its opportunity to bless man, by creating in him ideals of righteousness.

But man must consent to entertain these ideals, in preference to the false and fleeting ones which the less perfect environment—such as the motives of his fellow man, his

own carnal instincts and appetites, or even the whisperings of evil spirits—is urging upon him; otherwise God cannot "draw him" into the spiritual life.

When, therefore, of the multitude that listened to Peter on the day of Pentecost, three thousand souls were "born of God" in a day, we must believe that they consented to entertain the ideal of the spiritual life which the Holy Ghost put into their hearts, otherwise the Father could not have "given them" to Christ. So also of that other multitude who partook of the loaves and fishes; the reason of their failure to grasp the hidden significance of Christ's strange words, lay precisely in the obverse fact: they had refused to entertain the spiritual ideal which the Father was striving to form within them. Predestination had nothing whatever to do with either case.

These preliminaries being understood, let us come face to face with the tremendous significance of the fact which forms the theme of this chapter. No man can come unto Christ save the Father draw him. No man, in and of himself, has power to awaken his dormant spiritual life. No man can enter the kingdom of God, except he be born of the spirit. Vary the statement as much

as you will, the truth remains the same: "Coming unto Christ," "Awakening one's spiritual life," "entering the kingdom of God," all signify the beginning of a life which, when perfected, will be in harmony with the universe and therefore eternal; consequently, as only those things can co-exist between which there is no friction, there is no eternal life for the man or woman in whom the potentiality of the divine sleeps on. Between the eternally dormant and the eternally dead there is no difference save in name.

Several important questions confront us now. We have seen that man in and of himself is powerless to begin the new life, let him do what he will in the way of observing tenet, ordinance, and commandment; but God is equally helpless to do so for him without the co-operation of man's will. It requires the united will of both God and man in the most solemn compact of which intelligences are capable. Nor could this be otherwise, as we shall see later, when we discuss the vital significance of the spiritual life.

The next proposition to which I invite attention, is this: The conditions involved in the evolution of the spiritual life are not *fiat*

conditions, depending upon the *ipse dixit* of Omnipotence; they are organic conditions depending upon eternal law; which proposition I shall try to make clear in my next chapter.

V.

THE VINE AND THE BRANCHES.

"I am the vine, ye are the branches; he that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing."—Jesus Christ.

No statement of my theme,—which is, that the spiritual life involves a vitally organic relationship between God and man,—could be more felicitous or suggestive than that above quoted. I have only to develop the bearings of this splendid metaphor to make my subject clear.

In the statement, "I am the vine," it is Christ the Savior, not Jesus the man, that speaks. Christhood I have already defined as that aspect of Godhood whose special mission is to awaken and nurture the spiritual life in man. This saving power stands in the same relation to our Elder Brother, through whom it becomes operative, that the life of the vine, a mysteri-

ous spiritual entity, stands to the vine itself as a physical expression. And just as this life of the vine is a reality, although quite impalpable to our senses, so the saving power of Christhood, elsewhere in scripture called the grace of God, must not be thought of as simply God's *ipse dixit,* but as a living, vital energy flowing from the Infinite, through the medium of Christ, into the souls of men.

"I am the vine," says Jesus, "and my Father is the husbandman." Without the husbandman there could be no vine; without the vine, there could be no branches,—in fact no life whatever could be manifested, for there would be no physical vehicle for it. So, too, as Christ also points out, there must be continuous, unbroken connection between vine and branches or the latter must die. "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me . . . for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered."

Paul's representation of the Church is that of the human body, in which the organs stand for the various officers and the blood for the spirit of grace which flows from God

through the members uniting all the Saints as one body of Christ. It is very effective for Paul's purpose, but Christ's figure of the vine seems better,—as showing more varied aspects. Thus, for instance, our Lord illustrates what inevitably becomes of the member who is in the Church but not of it: "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he [my Father] taketh away." Such a member cannot hold his place; for even if the knife be not used, he withers, then dries, then is sloughed off. The only condition on which a branch can remain is that it bear fruit: the more fruit it bears, the more of the life of the vine it appropriates to itself.

In the living vine, there will always be a fluctuating relationship between the inner life and its physical expression; precisely as there is between faith and works in the living church. Conceive, however, of a vine without any life in it, an artificial vine whose branches are nailed on and whose leaves, flowers, and fruit(!) take shape and color by virtue of glue, paste, and paint. Conceive, you say? What would be the object of constructing such a vine?

None whatever, so far as the vine is concerned. But what of the multitude of so-called churches of Christ, for which my

supposed vine stands as a type? Would there be no object in setting up these? How many of the social usages to which the world wags today are vitally organic in their growth and development, and how many are merely bedizzened conventionalities? We have improved vastly over our forefathers in the naturalness of our dress, food, drink, recreation, manners, civil conventions, and other social customs; but has religion kept pace with civilization in this regard? Following out Christ's conception of the vine, religion ought never to have had the first taint of artificiality. Its evolution in spiritual life should have been as inevitably natural and beautiful as that of the lily in the field; instead of which, however, go into any of the churches harking back to mediæval times and examine the trumpery in tenet and ceremonial still paraded before men.

Of all the shams and make-believes that have at various epochs held mankind, those of religion withstand the iconoclast longest; being embalmed, as it were, in men's veneration and superstition. How far, alas, have Christians departed from the simplicity of Him who said, "I am the vine, ye are the branches!" As well expect the sap to flow

to the leaves of a painted vine, as believe that the spirit of grace will make alive and sanctify all this artificial pomp and show.

But leaving mechanical religions aside, let us examine some of the tendencies toward artificiality in the living, growing church. If Christ is the vine, there are two ways of securing branches; by grafting (or budding) and by natural growth. The first represents conversions from the world, the second the birth of children under the covenant. There are interesting situations growing out of both.

The moment you compare the awakening of the spiritual life with the placing of a bud into a living vine, you proclaim the fact that a true conversion is the establishing of an organic relation with the soul of the universe. The bud must itself be alive, and its life must moreover be of a kind that can be attuned to the life of the tree, or there will be no commingling of the two. Man, the agent of nature, puts the bud in place and protects it, but there his instrumentality ends. No pronouncement of horticultural authorities, however eminent, will now affect the result. The life of the tree flows into the bud or it does not. Eternal law presides over this union. In the miracle thus

attempted, as in that other of which it is the type, the bud cannot become an integral part of the vine, unless the Father of all life "draw it" there.

But note now the alternative: While there can be no shamming in the union of bud and vine,—whoever heard of vegetable hypocrisy?—this is not true always in the union of souls unto Christ. Where the human spirit has not been attuned by faith and repentance to the spirit of the Infinite, that mysterious touch whereby the life of God flows into the heart of man, cannot take place, even though an angel from heaven preside over the altar. Nay, there is no power in the universe that could do it; for though nothing (possible in itself) is impossible to God, yet he could not save and make part of the kingdom of heaven an unrepentant soul: it would be nothing less than the uniting of contradictories.

As suggested above, the bud has no alternative: it must either "stick" and bear fruit, or shrivel up and fall off. Not so (apparently) with the human scion: it frequently adheres to the growing tree of life by virtue of dissimulation, that almost universal glue whereby the conventions of society hang together: and such are the

mechanical fruits it brings forth in the shape of prayers and punctilious attention to forms and ceremonies, that it frequently deceives the very elect.

I have intimated that there is a difference between the law of life cleaving unto life in the vegetable and the human world respectively. But is this really true, after all? In the sight of God with whom a thousand years are as one day, does not the soul that "makes believe" to be part of the kingdom, begin at once to shrivel, even like the bud that fails to "take?" And will it not as surely fall off when eternity comes, in spite of its clumsy attempts to imitate the spontaneous works of grace?

"What fools these mortals be" indeed! And in nothing is their folly so barefaced as in the clap-traps of religion. We smile in pity at the heathen and his praying machine. But how much better are the mechanical devices of the Christian, involving lip, knee, cross, and rosary? "I am the vine, ye are the branches." Religion is the evolution of spiritual life. It belongs to the domain of biology not the domain of physics. Only that can co-exist with the universe which is indissolubly united in truth and harmony with the universe. Earth life presents ten

thousand examples of society held loosely together by mechanical bonds—forms and conventions that must be written down and memorized. The only society that shall endure when time is no more is that in which soul shall be united to soul by an affinity transcending knowledge; an affinity which begins with the awakening of the spiritual life and ends by making the soul one with Christ as Christ is now one with the Father.

VI.

WHY IMMORTALITY IS POSSIBLE ONLY ON THE BASIS OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE.

"As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me."—Jesus Christ.

We have some deep thoughts to think in this chapter and the next: let the reader enter upon them with a spirit of reverent concentration.

"I am the bread of life," says our Savior. "If any man eat this bread he shall live forever." In this figure, bread stands for food, and without food man dies. But it is not the physical life of which he is speaking. It is the life of the soul. Without Christ, the life of the soul comes to an end; with him it

lives for ever. Such is the doctrine we are to make self-evident.

As a preliminary let us understand what is meant by eternal life. If man, as taught by Joseph Smith, is co-eternal with God, then he is without beginning and without end—whatever befalls. But his existence previous to birth in heaven was evidently one of consciousness alone—consciousness without power. This was not life, for life involves growth, progress, increase of power; whence alone comes bliss.

The soul that fails to eat the bread of life cannot be annihilated as an intelligence since it is eternal; but its life must end—the life of eternal progress whose ultimate goal is to become perfect as God is perfect. Life as opposed to mere being or existence man now has; it represents the accumulated reaction upon his ego of countless ages of obedience to God. But it is not yet eternal life: it may swing back again to the endless monotony of mere existence.

Christ's doctrine is this: that we have reached a stage in our evolution when a change is necessary, if we would go on further. That change he figuratively calls the "bread of life" and then announces that he is that bread. His promise is, that "who-

soever eateth this bread shall live forever;" that is to say, the life which now is tentative, shall by eating this bread become eternally secure.

To vary the figure: before us lies the summit of eternity; whoever passes this shall partake of the nature of God—shall live a life of eternal progress, (and therefore of eternal bliss). The soul that chooses Christ for a guide will pass this summit safely; but the soul that refuses to choose him will fail to reach it. As there can be no eternity of lingering on this side, such a soul has but one alternative; it must go back to the point of being whence it started. This means that all the power which it has accumulated by countless ages of obedience, will ultimately be stripped away. It must die the second death,—the death of the spirit. In other words, it must drop back to the barren plain of mere existence.

Latter-day Saints believe that this must inevitably be the alternative of every soul, even as Christ says; but unlike Christians, they do not narrow the day of choice to this brief span of earth existence. It is both unreasonable and unscriptural to hold that lives which the patience and long suffering of God has advanced to this splendid stage of

power, shall be eclipsed by their first refusal to spiritual awakening. There is opportunity still for repentance after death. Moreover, we take hope in Christ's prophecy that every knee shall bow and every tongue confess,* and that no souls shall ultimately remain unforgiven save them that commit the unpardonable sin.†

Such is the unequivocal doctrine of the spiritual life as enunciated by Christ. Were my purpose merely to make the doctrine plain, I should stop here; but my desire is to understand it—to realize why it must be so. If the doctrine be true, it is true in and of itself, and not because God decreed it (in the sense that He might have decreed otherwise), nor because Christ proclaimed it; it is true because the universe demands it—because it is in consonance with the very nature and integrity of the all-in-all.

Begin your reasoning from the one thing that we cannot think otherwise than eternally fixed and immutable—the universe itself. Since this must remain as it is, whatever changes come to creations within its bosom, it becomes the final criterion of things eternal. At variance in nature and purpose with the harmony and integrity of the all-

*Rom., 14:11. †Matt., 12: 31, 32.

in-all no created thing can endure for ever; for it must ultimately come into clash with the fixed and immutable nature of the universe and so be broken to pieces. Conversely, that which is at one with the nature and harmony of the universe, must have eternal existence by virtue of that oneness; since there would be no power in the universe to overthrow it.

Christ's doctrine put in terms of this thought may be thus stated: individual intelligences can be at one with the universe only as they function on the spiritual plane. The natural plane is only a transitory one, as the experiences of life sufficiently testify.

That all things earthly must die and pass away, has become a proverb among all people. But perhaps experience does not always suggest the ultimate reason: viz., that mortal life and all its concomitants, are at variance with the fixed nature of the universe, and therefore cannot endure eternally. Nor did God design that the natural world should continue forever; its evident purpose is merely as a means of transition from one fixed state of man, that of a barren, impotent consciousness, to another fixed state, that of infinite creative power.

That our Father in heaven, though a personal being like Christ, has attained to this power, we must believe on the evidence of our senses: on the evidence that we are, and that a solar system has been created by Him to aid our transition toward a similar state. That He is at one with the universe we must believe also; no less on the natural grounds that a being not so united could scarcely have attained to creative power, than on the declaration of scripture, that He is one with the Holy Ghost, which is the scriptural equivalent of what I have called the infinite harmony and integrity of the universe.

If now we have perceived how and why the Father's life is eternal, we have a basis for comprehending the conditions of immortality for man. To be one with the Father is to be one with the universe; and to be one with the universe, is to be safely past the possibility of friction with universal law; in other words, it is to be spiritually homogeneous with infinite Truth. What could prevent immortality, under such circumstances?

Note now that it is precisely on this ground of oneness with the Father, that Christ bases his power to save man. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by

the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, *dwelleth in me and I in him.*" Could oneness with God, and therefore with the universe, be put in more searching terms than this?

Why Christ chose this peculiarly forceful metaphor of 'eating his flesh and drinking his blood,' we shall discuss in the next chapter. But if we would know once for all what it means, we have only to consider well the words which I have placed in italics: we eat his flesh and drink his blood, when we attain that state of oneness with him whereby he may be said to dwell in us and we in him. Since there was in fact such a union between him and the Father, he must himself have done figuratively with the Father what he now asks man to do with him.

No declaration of our Savior is more emphatic or more common than that "My Father and I are one." So intimate is this union that Christ speaks of himself as being in the Father and the Father in him: "Neither pray I for these [his disciples] alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word [all mankind in whom the spiritual life shall be awakened]; that they all may be one, *as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee*, that they may be one in us."*

When the scriptures declare that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one, what is it but saying in other words that two individualized beings, related as father and son, have both attained to harmony with the universe? Under no other condition can we conceive rationally the possibility of individual immortality. But under this condition, we cannot conceive rationally any escape from immortality.

Apply now this simple reasoning to man's hope of eternal life. Does it need the declaration of divine authority to convince us that unless Christ be formed within us—unless we are at one with him and the Father—it is not possible to attain the life everlasting? Is not this doctrine self-evident? As before pointed out, such a union is impossible on the fluctuating basis of the natural life; it must therefore take place, if it take place at all, on the basis of the spiritual life. And that is why "no man can see the kingdom of God unless he be born again;" and why no man can enter it unless he is born of the water and of the Spirit.

*John 17: 20, 21.

VII.

NATURE OF THE LIFE WHICH CHRIST GIVES TO MAN.

"As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself."—Jesus Christ.

Hitherto we have spoken only in figurative terms of the change which is to fit man for eternal life. Perhaps from its very nature we shall not be able to approach it more definitely. Nevertheless if I can take away some of the vagueness surrounding the subject like a halo; if I can give it more weight by putting into terms of the natural life some of the suggestions clinging about the revelations of the spiritual, I shall have accomplished the purpose of this chapter.

Consider then first the solemn declaration of our Savior: "Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

'Flesh and blood' stand here for the all-in-all of the physical life. It was practically the only life with which his hearers were familiar. He must approach the unknown through the medium of the known. It was

not the life of flesh and blood, but that other life, spoken of in the passage introducting this chapter, that he desired them to eat and drink.

They would not be essentially better should they merely mingle his natural life with theirs; that is, should they 'eat the flesh and drink the blood' of the man Jesus. But let them mingle with theirs his spiritual life; let them 'eat the flesh and drink the blood' of Christ, i. e., take into their souls the essential essence of Christhood; let them kindle in their lives the life that the Father kindled in him—then indeed should they live forever, and Christ 'would raise them up at the last day.'

Thus Christ makes the physical life a type of the spiritual. But the metaphor is even richer still in its symbolism. In using those words, Christ probably had in view the sacrament of the Lord's Supper established later in his ministry.

When we partake of the bread and the wine we are figuratively eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ. But note carefully this fact: we do it "for a witness," as the sacramental prayer says, and not because there is saving virtue in the bread and wine themselves. For a witness of what?

That our lives are daily absorbing Christhood, that our spiritual natures have been awakened and are being kept alive through the medium of the Holy Ghost; that Christ is in us, by his Spirit, and we in him, even as the Father and Son are in each other.*

In passing I may mention the fact that, just as the cruel doctrine of predestination grew out of misinterpretation of a passage previously referred to, so from the words, "Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood there is no life in you," has sprung up a still more mischievous doctrine called "transubstantiation," which assumes that after the bread and wine are blessed by the priest, they cease to be bread and wine: they have been changed into the real flesh and blood of Christ. Millions of souls are lulled into a false security, under the belief that they are complying with the conditions of eternal life when they masticate a consecrated wafer!

Let us next ask the question: What is this Life which the Father had in himself and

*The Sacramental prayer makes us witness that "we take upon us His name, and keep His commandments that we may have His Spirit to be with us." All the things I enumerate above take place in lives of which the sacramental testimony bears true witness. It is the same thing from the view point of results.

which he gave to the Son; the Life which the Son would give to men, under the figure of making them eat his flesh and drink his blood; the Life which is spoken of under the various guises of "being born of the Spirit," "Coming unto God," "passing from death unto life," "the kingdom of God within man," "having Christ formed within us," and "obtaining a testimony of the Gospel?" What is this Life without which our souls must die, but with it, live forever? Can we define it in terms that shall bring it still nearer home to our comprehension? Let us try.

"In the beginning," says John, "was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men."* From the fact that the Apostle adds further on: "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt with us," the passage is commonly taken to refer to the man Jesus; whereas by a little thought it will be seen to refer to Christ, the office held by Jesus.

*John, 1: 1-4.

I am going to read the passage in this way: "In the beginning was Godhood and Godhood was with God [i. e. the perfected man], and Godhood was God. [It was by virtue of the office that the perfected man became God]. All things were made by him [the office plus the man; without whom Godhood could not become operative], and without him was nothing made that was made.

"In him [i. e. God, the office plus the man] was life, and the life was the light of men." [Without the union of the two there could have been no life, no light, no creations]. . . . And Godhood was made flesh [i. e. was conferred upon the man Jesus, whence he became Christ] and dwelt among us [i. e. the office plus the man], full of grace and truth."

This interpretation, which space will not permit me to elaborate,* will be found in full consonance with scripture, and will explain a multitude of situations which must otherwise remain mysteries. The original word for which the translators put "Word" and which I have rendered God-

*For a full discussion of the relation of Godhood and Priesthood, also the relation of the office to the being who bears it, I refer the reader to my book entitled "Scientific Aspects of Mormonism."

hood, meaning that power in the universe by virtue of which our Father in heaven is God,—was the Greek word *logos.* Very little can be gained by looking up its etymology. John evidently used it very much as we use the letter x in algebra. It stood then, as it stands now, for the "mystery of Godliness." That it meant something more, however, than the personality of Christ, is evident from the fact that the apostle did not say: "In the beginning was Jesus," nor even, "In the beginning was Christ." If we abstract the power which made Jesus the Christ, and which makes our Father God, we shall probably have the true significance of the word.

Note now how the text agrees with the passage at the opening of this chapter. "In him was life," says John, "and the life was the light of men." Is not this the same life that the Savior refers to in these words: "As the Father had life in himself, so he gave to the Son to have life in himself"? And this life is the light of men, the light and life brought from the Father by Christ, and given by him unto men; the spiritual life, without which the soul must perish.

We have had many equivalents in expression for the spiritual life, but John is now to add to the list one more. He speaks of those

who are spiritually awakened as having, by that change, become sons of God. "As many as received him [i. e. the Word plus the man] to them gave he power to become sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, but of God."* And this last aspect of the new life promises to be more fruitful than any of the others in making clear precisely what that change signifies.

In the sense that God is the father of our spirits, all men, converted or otherwise, are sons of God. Now, it is not possible to become what we already are; John's expression must therefore stand for an entirely different and advanced relationship. The difference is probably this: The first birth, the birth of our spirits in pre-existence, makes us sons of God the personal Father; our second birth,—not our mortal birth, but our spiritual awakening,—makes us sons of God in the sense of Godhood, the sense expressed by the "Word" in John's revelation.

This is precisely the sense in which Jesus is the Son of God. He was a spirit born of God as we are; but he became the Son of God when the "life" which the Father had

*John, 1: 12, 13.

in himself, was given to him that he also might have life in himself; and we become Sons of God when Christ transfers this same life to us. Beings who have this life in common may be said to live in each other; even as the Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father.

Now we see the significance of the passage: "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son, hath not life." Sonship in the sense in which Jesus was the Son of God, is nothing less than the beginning of Godhood; and Godhood is Life, Reason, Intelligence, the active, causative Principle of the universe; it is Omnipotence, Omniscience, Omnipresence, the power to create ,control, change; a Power infinite, absolute, and eternal; nevertheless a Power which must forever hang potential in the universe, till a personal will take hold of it and make it dynamic for purposes of spiritual evolution.

Such is the significance of Christ's injunction: "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect." Christ came to reveal God: to show that Godhood could be attained by man; nay, to show that unless it be attained in some degree, there is no eternal life for man. The life and power

he received from the Father he gives unto man. He is our Elder Brother; we, too, become Sons of God—joint heirs with him. To the extent that we attain to Godhood, to that extent we shall have glory, dominion, and exaltation. He who fails to attain the lowest degree of the life of God, must die the second death; for eternal life is nothing else than Godhood.

VIII.

SPIRITUAL LIFE IN THE NATURAL WORLD.

"Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."—Jesus Christ.

Somehow the notion is deeply ingrained in most people that to be spiritual-minded is to be goody-good, to wear a Sunday face, and have a prayer-meeting flavor to one's conversation; in short to talk and act in a way supposed to be the fashion of that indeterminate place called heaven. Unconsciously the spiritual world is figured as a place far away from the natural world; a place to be reached only by death, and then only on condition that you have been "good" in the conventional religious sense.

Such a notion is peculiarly attractive to

the supersentimental or watery, yellowish-green type of mankind; with the natural result that the vigorously intellectual, the men and women of hearty, robust human nature, remain by themselves, a class hilariously unregenerate; who, when pressed to join the ranks of religion, usually declare that they are willing to chance the final reckoning on the basis of an honest, moral life, without any of the sanctimonious trimmings.

Let us once and for all lay aside this sickish-sweet, conventional notion of being "religious;" this hushed and awesome sanctity which seizes us in the presence of a minster, a church, or a cemetery. Let us lay it in the same grave with the groans, the holy amens, and all the other species of that sniveling, psalm-singing cant with which the Pharisee of every age envelopes himself as with a cloak. And if on occasion the accumulated hypocrisy and reverence for convention transmitted in our blood should momentarily betray us, let us go out and look the sun squarely in the face, and open our lungs to the perennial freshness of nature; so shall we purge away the untruth which we permitted unwittingly to soil the native honesty of our souls.

For the truly religious attitude is that

which the soul must assume in response to nature; in response to the breath of the earth and the sky, to the flood-tide of glory from the sun, and to the penetrating mystery and awe from the stars. To be spiritual-minded is to be natural and human—to be honestly and truly one's self, however the standards of convention may be shocked thereby; for in no other attitude of mind, can one be in a way to be moulded by the influences of the real heaven.

And what is the real heaven? The sum-total of the soul's natural environment at any given epoch in its spiritual evolution. This environment may change—must change, as the exigency of growth and development may demand. And so, far off in the future, we shall probably reach a state such as the seer of today calls heaven; which, however, is not heaven until we are fitted for it—indeed, would be hell were we suddenly put into it now. Heaven is the *here* and *now* of any stage in the soul's growth, and the spirit of heaven is the spirit that breathes in upon us from the natural world; which, however it may change as we change, will continue always to be the natural world. In other words, it will be just that adjustment of environment which the

Father deems best adapted to react on our souls with a view to making them perfect as He is perfect.

But the here and now, or the soul's natural environment at any given stage, may also be its hell. All depends on its attitude toward the universe. Looked at from God's point of view, the world of present environment is heaven—the highest heaven which the soul is capable of apperceiving; but looked at from Lucifer's,—that is to say, from the point of view of opposition to God and the universe,—it is hell. There remains consequently the third or intermediate attitude, in which nine out of every ten men find themselves; an attitude neither heaven nor hell, but one which veers now toward progress, now toward retrogression, and which must ultimately declare itself for or against God.

The spiritual world, as will thus be seen, is not a world apart and remote from the sphere of daily human experiences: it is rather a definite way of looking at these experiences and drawing truth and character from them; viz., the way in which God would look at them and profit by them, were he in man's place. To God all things are spiritual. At the close of each "day" in

Genesis, He looked upon his work and pronounced it "good." So to the man in heaven, —I mean the man who is living the spiritual life on earth,—all God's handiwork is good; and even from the evils of life,—evils resulting from man's free will clashing with eternal law,—he has learned also to extract the good.

Such a man is truly in the kingdom of God—heir to all its glory, and joint heir with that other Son of God, his Elder Brother. All the fruits of the Spirit—love, joy, peace—are his, to the extent that his soul has capacity for them. If the angels near God's throne enjoy greater bliss, it is not that they differ from him in species: it is simply that they have longer been "born of God," and their souls are consequently more nearly attuned to the harmonies of the universe.

How perfectly this thought agrees with the passage which declares that the 'kingdom of God is within man;' or the numerous passages which set forth that being 'born of God' is 'putting on the new man in Christ Jesus,' or being 'conformed to the image of Jesus Christ.' The universe itself is the kingdom of God to the Creator; he then who has the kingdom formed within him,

must begin to see the universe as God sees it. But Christ sees it now as does the Father; consequently to be formed in Christ's image is get his point of view, and therefore the Father's, in all things.

Now if seeing things as God sees them constitutes the essential fact of heaven or membership in the kingdom of God, then seeing things from the view-point of Satan must constitute the essential fact of hell. What is the essential fact of the intermediate ground? A confusion of view points,—an endless medley of truth and error. As might be expected, this middle ground is a hatchery of creeds, orders, societies, religions, governments; a seething mass of humanity struggling for the right, but never quite reaching it; "ever learning but never coming to the knowledge of the truth." And God calls this middle ground Babylon—a very appropriate name.

IX.

SPIRITUAL LIFE IN THE NATURAL WORLD, CONTINUED.

"And I heard another voice saying, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins and that ye receive not of her plagues."—John the Revelator.

If now it be asked what change is involved in a man's life by being 'born of God,' the

answer in large is that he comes out of Babylon into Zion. Many simple-minded people have interpreted Christ's warning, "Come out of her, my people," to mean a bodily exodus, or change of place. It may mean this, too, as we shall see presently; but the essential fact in this warning, is to cease viewing life and its duties from the trivial, criss-cross standpoints of the natural man, and begin to view them in the eternal perspective from which God looks at them. For as Babylon stands for sin, the natural outcome of confusion, so Zion stands for the "pure in heart," or righteousness, the natural outcome of perceiving and obeying law, or the will of God.

But coming out of Babylon into Zion is too general a discription of the change in conduct which results from seeing as God sees. Let us come to a more detailed expression. What changes, for instance, are involved in the physical life?

The criterion here, as in all other aspects of eternal life, is the Creator himself: "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect," involves first of all the development of a perfect physical body. What that signifies in large cannot be discussed here. Suffice it to say that so far as mortal life goes, it

may thus be set down. Coming out of Babylon in the physical sense involves the developing of a body fitted to do the things that need to be done. This means first of all perfect physical health; secondly, perfect procreative powers; thirdly, strength and skill for physical achievement in the multiform directions required by the work of this world.

Needless to say, these results do not come through any occult endowment by the Father of those who have entered his kingdom. They come first from understanding physical law, and second from obeying physical law. Seeing as God sees, enables man to know what is law; doing as God would do, enables him to reap the physical blessing in terms of health, strength, and power to do what needs to be done.

This is the whole mystery of physical salvation. And no place or time in the universe is better for this development than the here and now; for God has arranged in this world a certain physical environment, which, properly reacted upon by us, builds us up; but which improperly reacted upon, or not reacted upon at all, breaks us down. Nor is prayer or the pouring of oil effectual as substitutes for obedience to physical law. All

such pitiful subterfuges are properly characterized by scripture as faith without works, and are dead.

We shall next consider what coming out of Babylon means in the intellectual sense.

The intellectual is the inventive or creative aspect of Godhood. It was by virtue of this power that our Father made the world and all things therein; and all the achievements of man, which are summed up in the term civilization, would have been impossible without this same endowment. Man's intellectual powers may differ from God's in degree,—even as the tiny sun mirrored in a dew-drop is smaller than its glorious original,—but they do not differ in kind; and given an eternity in which to increase in power, they may become perfect even as His are perfect. It was therefore no mere burst of hyperbole that led the poet to exclaim: "What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason, how infinite in faculties! In form and moving how express and admirable! In action how like an angel, in apprehension how like a God!"

If this power is so essential a part of Godhood, it follows that man cannot be saved even in the lowest degree of glory without its development. Indeed, it is this power

more than any other, that individualizes man—makes him a sovereign; without it, he distrusts himself, and becomes an echo of others. Now if Godhood means anything, it means individuality; and Godhood is what we begin to partake of when we are 'born of God.' Fancy a man being saved, and yet have to wait for his cue as to right and wrong, or the thing to do next, along a row of ten thousand other intellectual weaklings!

And this thought brings us face to face with the crying defect in the so-called intellectual training in the world. Instead of making sovereigns of men, it endows one here and there,—or rather he endows himself in spite of it,—with independence in thought and judgment, and trains ten thousand others to listen for the tinkle of his bell and be content to eat his dust. It is even worse in that part of Babylon given over to religions. In churches where dogmatism rules whatever the priest says is law to the people, and whatever the pope says is law to the priest. Nor are things improved in the boneless, sinewless, nerveless theology of emotional religions. How, for instance, can you account for the vapid goody-good ap-

peal , and the maudlin sentimentality of song, prayer, and sermon,—which serve to keep the man of ideas at home on Sundays,—save by the absence in church service of that robust quality of the lecture-room,—intellectuality?

But Zion has by no means worked out this aspect of salvation either. The number among us who wait for others to chew up their intellectual food for them, is appalling. There are even those who count it a virtue, —in others, let us say,—to have that degree of meekness which shall make them "follow counsel," without asking why. In order that I may not be misunderstood, let us think this thought out.

Suppose a man achieves a certain result through meekly, not to say blindly, obeying counsel. Is his soul any richer or stronger thereby? Remember, it is not results which react to build up character; it is planning. The man who let others think for him may, in a vulgar sense, possess the extraneous results—a fine crop of grain, a million dollars, a political office, or whatever else the paltry outcome may be,—but will he be one whit the more intelligent as farmer, financier, or politician? These external results do

not affect his soul; they go back through him to the man that did the thinking: he is only an extra limb of that man.

Salvation is an individual achievement, God furnishing the opportunity. It accumulates, not in terms of extraneous results, as so many missions, so much tithing, such regularity in prayers, fastings, or meetings, so many dollars contributed to building a temple, and so on; it accumulates in terms of soul development, in terms of character, and intelligence. Results are measures of soul-progress only if they are *our* results. No one else can think our way for us into the kingdom of God; for the kingdom can never be ours to a greater extent than it shall be formed within us, whatever be the external pronouncements on our heads.

"Following counsel," therefore, in the sense of letting another decide for you, is worthless as a means of salvation. Nay, more; it may be vicious as being the very source of priestcraft in him who assumes to give such advice, and of spiritual slavery in him who receives it. But following counsel as the expression is used in our Church,—that is, receiving instruction from men of experience who have one's welfare at heart, and then making up one's mind to follow it

or not,—that is entirely a different matter. It would be difficult to see how unity and harmony could be maintained in any social organization without such free interchange of ideas.

It is probably the social, moral, and spiritual attributes of the soul which make us 'good;' if so, it is the intellectual attribute which makes us "good for something." Everywhere is this power in demand. It is the savor of wit, the salt of wisdom, and the basic ingredient in common sense. Without the tang of intellectuality, prayer, song, and discourse become insipid and nauseating; with it, properly co-ordinated with feeling, they invigorate and stir to action. The highest endowment of intellectual power is therefore not incompatible with the noblest development of the spiritual life. It will be only when we shall have among us the intellectual giants of the race,—specialists in all that concerns the advancement of the world,—that those predictions will be fulfilled which say that Zion shall become a light unto the nations.

Consider then this vital attribute of the intellectual life, and ask whether a more admirable place and time than the here and now could be conceived for its evolution.

Problems surmounted and understood are the means of its development, and problems are everywhere; inviting attention at eye or ear and by taste, or touch, or smell; problems of natural and physical science; of literature and art; of history, economics, and sociology,—everywhere are problems. And taking into account the whole range of investigation open to man, the problems so vary in difficulty that there is a place for every soul to begin, however low or high in the scale of intelligence. Nor would a million years of application exhaust the opportunities thus spread before mankind by the great Teacher.

Now while the development of intellectuality is in no way retarded, but on the contrary is rather accelerated, by the awakening of the spiritual life, it is not to be supposed that problems would, were we perfectly under God's guidance, be undertaken in the same way as now obtains in the world. This part of man's development would be correlated with all others; and while it would be pure speculation in me to say what that order must be, this principle would perhaps largely govern it. The range of objects studied would be such that, while yielding intellectual power as their essential product,

they would yet fit man directly for his mission in life; that is, fit him to do the things which God would have him do, in assisting to regenerate the world.

Of course where the spiritual life begins in a world so warped by convention and tradition as ours, there is scarcely time, during the short period allotted to man on earth, to get completely away from Babylon in the methods of the soul evolution. It is therefore not disparaging to say that we have not yet worked out satisfactorily the problem of intellectual education in Zion: our academies and colleges being conducted along intellectual lines common to similar schools in the world. We can at least hold up the ideal of strong individualization in thinking power as opposed to mere scholarship and the scramble for diplomas. The intellectually trained man needs no placard. He is a thinker, and counts one anywhere in weight and judgment. Fancy announcing by a sheepskin on the wall that gold is yellow, ductile, and non-corrosive!

We may now briefly examine some other aspects of the spiritual life evolving in the natural world. From the fact that immunity from suffering is purchasable by living hygienic lives, men may be trusted to find

out and obey God's will as expressed in physical law; so also, from the fact that intellectual power is directly related to leadership and consequently to wealth and social prestige, the intellectual side of education is likely to grow more and more in accordance with divine law. Therefore the man or woman guided by the Spirit of God in his spiritual development, will not have need to diverge as widely from the best standards in Babylon in these two aspects, as in that of the social and moral world, of which I now desire to speak.

From the nature of the facts, it is extremely difficult by human processes of generalization to get at the truth—that is to say, God's will, or the harmony of the universe,—in social and moral relationships. Take away the Ten Commandments, and all the other guides to conduct given by revelation, and how long would it take the world to generalize these truths from experience? Let us grant that no divine precept has the effect of law upon the race, until experience demonstrates over and over the truth of it. Still, there it is before the race, as something to be tried, even while they are blundering on in opposition to it. Suppose it were not there. Where would the wisdom come from that

should pick it up from a million cases of suffering for want of it, and give it the form of law?

Nor should it be forgotten that it is for the social and moral world that all soul evolution finds its end and purpose. Heaven, the perfect social world, where absolute justice presides, and where love, joy, and peace are normal social products—this is the ideal held out for perfecting our physical as well as our intellectual powers. All the raw materials for developing social righteousness are here: men, women, and the thousand relationships, back and forth, which grow out of their mutual needs; and implanted in each soul are the germs of the social qualities to be developed: justice, mercy, truth, love. Situations confront us daily and hourly, which, reacted upon rightly, fit us for heaven, by creating heaven within us; but which, reacted upon wrongly, create discord within us and,—by the law that we inevitably act out what we are—also without us. But what is right conduct? Some general maxims we have; but the combinations involving their application vary so much that they are often honored as much in the breach as in the observance.

It is here, then, that the spiritually born

reap their greatest blessing. To be in Christ as Christ is in the Father; in other words, to see right and wrong in the social and moral world as Christ and the Father see them; to know how to react upon any situation, by realizing what the Son of God would do—this is the supreme guerdon of the spiritual life to man.

But now comes a crisis in which Babylon ceases to be merely a state of mind, and becomes a place from which the convert would flee if he could, to Zion—also a place now by the same soul experience; for no sooner does he attempt to act out the social truth as God makes him feel it, than he finds himself isolated, and so acting toward his fellow-men as to call down their execrations upon his head. How lonely he feels then! Straightway the inner Zion begins calling for the outer Zion, and he must obey. Such is the genesis of the spirit of gathering.

Have I made my thesis clear, that the spiritual life is to be lived in the natural world? Not only is the natural world the best place to perfect the spiritual man, it is the only place for intelligences organized as we are now. Were this not so, God would have given us that other place instead of this

one. Here and here only, so far as we are concerned, are the problems physical, intellectual, moral and social, the overcoming of which is the means of making us perfect as God is perfect. To sigh for a purer, better world in order to be more spiritual-minded, is flatly to lie down and give up the fight. Thank God for the admirable world of sin, in which he has placed us; but thank him more for showing how to carve heaven out of it.

X.

CONCLUSION: THE PEARL OF GREATEST PRICE—HOW FOUND.

"Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you."—Jesus Christ.

Next to passing from existence into life, the most far-reaching event in the evolution of a soul is to be born again, "not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Passing from existence into life made us children of our Father in heaven; passing from pre-existent life into mortality, added a new relationship to the 'fathers of our flesh,' without changing our first relation-

ship to the 'Father of Spirits;'* but passing from the natural to the spiritual life, makes us sons of God—partakers of the power which makes our Father in heaven God. The first birth was of most importance, for without it we should not have seen life at all; the second or birth of the spirit is next in importance, for without it this life, now far advanced, must begin to stand still, then retrograde through various degrees of hell to the plane of mere existence. Eternal life is possible only by coming into harmony with eternal law, and law is the will of God.

Consider then, how tremendous is this epoch of the spiritual life, looked at from God's point of view. It is the crisis in the psychic evolution of the soul. Without it, life such as we have, begins to go back, ultimately to set beyond the horizon whence it rose; with it the soul shall have no setting, but go on and on forever, each crescent morn of being climbing to a still more glorious noon.

But from man's point of view? Alas, for the confusion of values here below! How

*Hebrews, 12-9: "Furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh, which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and live?"

must our Father in heaven feel, what must be the sadness of our guardian angels, when the event for which our souls have been shaping for perhaps a thousand million years,—is passed by, again and again, because of some trivial allurement of the physical senses! Reckless and heedless children of the Infinite that we are! Giving up our title to a star that we may pursue a fire fly!

Elsewhere I have placed all intelligences, whether in heaven, on earth, or in hell, into three classes; the workers, the worked-with, and the damned. The first class comprises all who are working intelligently and therefore in harmony with the universe; and by intelligently I mean, under the leadership of Jesus Christ. The second class includes the souls that are striving earnestly perhaps but unintelligently, the men and women of meteoric standards; in other words, the hosts of Babylon. They get their name, in this division, from the fact that the intelligent forces of the universe are ever-striving to win them over. The third class is made up of souls who, having taken sides against God, are thence stricken with lock-jaw of the will; that is to say, having sinned against the Holy Ghost, it can no longer come to them to give them repentance, and

consequently they are damned. To be damned is to be fighting the universe, without power to stop until you are undone.

The kingdom of God is a commonwealth of workers, with Jesus Christ as Captain of industry. Work—physical, intellectual, moral, social, spiritual—is only another name for reacting upon environment, and is therefore necessary to salvation. "Henceforth," said Jesus, "I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth, but I have called you friends: for all things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you." That is the key-word among the spiritually-born; equality to the extent that our souls have attained capacity for it. In no other way could 'we be in Christ, and he in us, even as the Father and Son are in each other.'

Up till the time of spiritual birth men are servants, as 'not knowing what their lord doeth:' doing things blindly always involves servitude. But thereafter they become free to the extent that they know; not only this, to the extent they know, know they know, to the extent they realize that in keeping the commandments of God, they are obeying eternal law, not cringing before the caprice of a being supreme by will only. Thus they

become 'sons of God,' beginners in the realm of creation, taking upon themselves Godhood—in other words Priesthood—* as they shall win victory after victory over environment.

Now is it thinkable that beings eternally free could enter into a mutual relationship, such as that between God and man, without mutual understanding and mutual consent? Christ has told us that man cannot come into this commonwealth of workers unless the "Father draw him." But the Father can draw no man who does not consent to be drawn. The relationship is therefore a mutual compact involving covenants. 'Born of the water and of the Spirit' is a figurative description of these covenants. 'Baptism by immersion for the remission of sins and the laying on of hands for the reception of the Holy Ghost, by one having authority to act for God,'—is a more complete statement, of the same thing. Let no man beguile himself into thinking he is 'born of God,' who neglects these divinely appointed ordinances.

And now for a moment let us consider the medium whence Christ can be in us and

*Priesthood is evidently related to Godhood as part to whole: Godhood in part is Priesthood; Priesthood in full is Godhood.

we in him; the well-spring or source of the spiritual birth; the means whereby man may look at things from God's point of view, and hence be one with Him; the new Life-fluid which, out of our daily experiences, organizes character, power, Godhood; just as the mysterious life of the vine organizes, from earth and air, the leaves, the flowers, the fruit, and the vine itself. This medium between God and man is called in scripture the Holy Ghost.

If we can conceive the "cosmic fluid" which fills the universe so impressed in rate of vibration by the will of the Creator, as to present the various phenomena of light, heat, electricity, actinism, chemism, and perhaps gravitation, it should not be difficult to conceive the will of God so coloring and surcharging the same infinite medium with his thought and feeling that it can, by the law of telepathy, reach and influence the soul of man; to the extent that it shall awaken and nourish his dormant spiritual nature, even as a sunbeam warms to life and being the lily of the field.

"And I will pray the Father," said Christ when he was about to depart, "and he shall send you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of

truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you.....And he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak; and he shall show you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you."*

It is through this Spirit that we are comforted, if consolation is what our souls stand in need of; and enlightened, if truth be the food we lack. In like manner it dispenses love, joy, peace, long-suffering, and all the other attributes of God, even as man's life shall have need of them. Indeed, it is the source of the spiritual life; ministering as easily to all the requirements of man's psychic evolution, as the sun nourishes and brightens alike each of a thousand hues in the flowers on the breast of mother earth.

Let us not forget, however, that this Spirit abides with man, not primarily because of works, which may be utterly mechanical and lifeless, but because man gives his heart to God, reserving nothing, but loving Him with all his might, mind, and strength. Un-

*John, 14: 16 and 16: 13, 14.

der such circumstances, there cannot fail to be works; but the works which count for life eternal are those only which are the natural reactions of grace, just as the leaf and flower are the inevitable outflowing of the life of the vine.

It is here that danger lurks in our religious life as a community. As there can be no true grace that does not express itself in works of righteousness, so we are likely to believe the converse equally true, and consequently urge men to godly works as the only means of salvation. But in this we may be utterly mistaken: works of righteousness may be carried out, under the stimulus of religious association, which are no more related to the spiritual life of him who does them, than branches tacked or glued on are vital parts of a growing vine.

Such works the Pharisees were very punctilious in performing, yet Christ had no other name for them than hypocrites and whited sepulchers; and Pharisees, let it be remembered, are not peculiar to any time or country. They are usually men and women without imagination, who would accumulate salvation on the same principle that they fill their barns and granaries; and who consequently look upon eternal life as a

barter of equivalents: so many requirements made by God in terms of prayer, song, tithes, meetings, rites, ceremonies, ordinations, and endowments, on the one hand, and such salvation and exaltation as a reward on the other. Who would be so rash as to say there are no Pharisees among Latter-day Saints today?

The danger of pharisaism is greatest perhaps in the education of our children. Trained from childhood by conscientious parents to revere the outward forms of religion, they are often held mechanically to external works of righteousness, as if salvation depended primarily upon these things. Fortunately, however, there is in the Church of Christ no ulterior motive for keeping up so artificial a relationship;*and so one of two things usually takes place: either they sink into a state of indifference in order to escape the pecuniary sacrifices and unpopularity involved in active membership, or else the vital spark of spirituality is kindled in their bosoms, and so the works they have been accustomed to doing, cease to be perfunctory and mechanical.

*Unless the desire to be married in the Temple of the Lord, be such an external motive. In most such cases, the Pharisaism lasts only long enough to accomplish this purpose, when it subsides to the state of indifference.

How to awaken the spiritual life of our children and so make a living bond between them and God, must ever remain the question before all other questions for Latter-day Saints to face. Habituating them by external pressure to works of righteousness is not the solution, as the thousands of young people who drift away from us into the world yearly must sufficiently testify. Space will not here permit me to take up all the bearings of this question. Let me close this article by re-stating it in the terms of Christ's parable of the vine and branches.

Children born under the covenant evidently stand in a relationship to the spiritual life different from that of converts from the world. If the latter may be represented by buds placed into the vine, then the former may be represented by natural buds formed on the vine. Now, buds placed in a vine may or may not grow and partake of the life of the trunk, but the natural buds are likely to do so. By how much more likely the natural buds are to have life in them than are the engrafted ones, by that much children of the covenant are more intimately related to the spiritual life, than are children of Babylon.

But natural buds sometimes remain dor-

mant, and this fact, as long as it holds, prevents them from becoming vital parts of the tree. The question, as applicable to my point is, how to force a dormant bud into life. Sometimes the bark of succeeding growths overlaps and buries it so deeply as to make its sprouting all but impossible.

By virtue of birth under the covenant, as also by virtue of baptism at eight years of age, our children are, like natural buds, filled with the potentiality of eternal life. But it sleeps in them, in nine cases out of ten. Their baptism and confirmation place them *in* the Church: they are not yet *of* it. No power save their own and God's combined can make them of it. Meanwhile the blessing of the spiritual life, the promise of grace involved in their baptism and confirmation, hangs over them, awaiting such time as they shall have the faith to call upon God for themselves, and shall desire—more than they desire anything else on earth—to be numbered among the workers under Jesus Christ: then and then only will the eternal life be born in them.

How to awaken the spiritual life of our children, already in the church yet not of it, is, I repeat, the supreme question. And here, too, the operation becomes the more difficult

as layer after layer of sin and worldliness have buried the precious bud from the light. This last condition at least every parent can prevent, if he will; the other condition, that of developing a testimony of the Gospel in the child, comes also within the range of a wise parent's influence. And so having introduced the most important aspect of my present theme, I leave it to the thought of my readers, and perhaps to some future discussion in the Mormon Point of View.

THE HARRIS-ANTHON EPISODE.

Thus far the "Dictionary of Slander" has been devoted mainly to the refutation of slanders connected with the Book of Mormon. One more matter may briefly be touched upon in the same connection; viz., the conflicting statements of Martin Harris and Professor Anthon with reference to what took place at their famous interview respecting the characters transcribed by the Prophet from the Gold Plates. The complete statements are too long for insertion here. I therefore make such excerpts from each as shall enable the reader to form some judgment as to their relative merits.

If ever there was a doubting Thomas, yet one honestly bent upon testing the claims of the youthful Prophet, that man was Martin Harris; and he had a wife more skeptical than himself,—and less honest, perhaps, if one may judge by the outcome of their lives. Naturally, therefore, he could not be induced to advance means toward translating and publishing the Book of Mormon without satisfactory proof that Joseph's claims were genuine. The time had not yet come to show the Plates to chosen witnesses, consequently Martin could not reassure himself by an examination of the original; the Prophet did the next best thing for him: he made a copy consisting of seven parallel lines of the characters on the Plates, and subjoined thereto a translation of them.*

Here was a means of satisfying himself, and perhaps of convincing his wife, who strongly opposed his associations with Joseph Smith. He first called on Dr. Samuel L. Mitchell of New York, who, unable to give him any satisfaction referred him to Prof. Charles Anthon. The following is in

*This transcript is now in the hands of the descendants of David Whitmer, one of the Three Witnesses. Copies have been rather widely published, a nd so I do not reproduce them here.

part what the latter has to say of the interview:

> "Upon examining the paper in question, I soon came to the conclusion that it was all a trick—perhaps a hoax. When I asked the person who brought it, how he obtained the writing, he gave me the following account [with which the reader is already familiar]. The farmer added that he had been requested to contribute a sum of money toward the publication of the Golden Book.....So urgent had been these solicitations, that he intended selling his farm and giving the amount to those who wished to publish the plates. As a last precautionary step, he had resolved to come to New York, and obtain the opinion of the learned about the meaning of the paper.....On hearing this odd story, I changed my opinion about the paper, and instead of viewing it any longer as a hoax, I began to regard it as part of a scheme to cheat the farmer of his money, and I communicated my suspicions to him to beware of rogues. He requested an opinion from me in writing, which of course, I declined to give, and he then took his leave, taking his paper with him."*

The points to bear in mind from this excerpt are three: (1) Martin Harris is said to have made the interview with Anthon a test of whether or not to advance money to Joseph Smith; (2) Professor Anthon claims to have pointed out in strong terms that the characters on the paper were the trick of a rogue who was after Harris's money; (3) Anthon claims that he refused to give Harris a written opinion. We may

*Letter to E. D. Howe, dated February 17, 1834, four years after the Book of Mormon was published.

now introduce Joseph Smith's statement of the report made by Martin Harris on his return:

> "Professor Anthon stated that the translation was correct, more so than any he had before seen translated from the Egyptian. I then showed him those which were not yet translated, and he said that they were Egyptian, Chaldaic, Assyriac, and Arabic, and he said that they were the true characters. He gave me a certificate certifying to the people of Palmyra that they were true characters, and that the translation of such of them as had been translated was correct. I took the certificate and put it into my pocket, and was just leaving the house, when Mr. Anthon called me back, and asked me how the young man found out that there were gold plated in the place where he found them. I answered that an angel of God had revealed it unto him.
>
> "He then said to me, 'Let me see that certificate.' I accordingly took it out of my pocket and gave it to him, when he took it and tore it to pieces, saying that there was no such thing now as the ministering of angels, and that if I would bring the plates to him he would translate them. I informed him that part of the plates were sealed, and that I was forbidden to bring them. He replied, 'I cannot read a sealed book.'"

There will perhaps be no getting at the exact truth in this episode. It is the privilege of every man interviewed to deny and denounce any statement attributed to him, if not over his own signature; and the examples of altercation between interviewer and interviewed have been numerous enough, both before and after this event, not to occasion surprise at the fact of discrepancies.

Nevertheless, it will probably be worth our while to balance probabilities in this case; especially as every anti-Mormon writer makes much of what he calls the manufactured testimony of Martin Harris.

In the first place, if we may judge by the result, then Martin's testimony must be believed, since so far from being discouraged by Anthon's words, he went back to Joseph, acted as scribe for three months, and when the time came, actually sold his farm to secure the money necessary to publish the first edition of the book.

On carefully examining some parts of his report, we may well conclude that he is guilty of that common fault of the ardent convert, especially if he be unlettered,—overstatement. Anthon might have said that the characters were a medley of "Chaldaic, Assyriac, Arabic, and Egyptian," since such a general description is suggested by them; but he would hardly have said that they were 'true characters' and that the 'translation was correct;' that is, if we give him credit for being really a careful scholar. Characters of this type are deciphered with too much labor and uncertainty to pronounce glibly upon them at sight. There is, of course, the possibility

that he was only a pseudo scholar, who might feel it necessary to his reputation to pass instant judgment upon anything occult in ancient languages. How could such a man pose as learned before the "plain, simple-hearted farmer," by even a moment's hesitation?

It must next be remembered that there was no social reason for an adverse report, "Mormonism" not being in existence as yet. The story told by Harris would appeal purely to the antiquarian, not the religious bigot. If it be urged that the story itself was incredible, let the reader bethink himself of the "gold-brick" inventions that have caught wiseacres of the library many a time before and since.

As to the exact terms of the certificate claimed to have been handed to him, Mr. Harris's memory may be excused if it err in detail or degree of emphasis; since he can hardly be said to have read it twice, before it was destroyed. It is a vital question, however, whether he received such a written statement from Prof. Anthon at all. That he did, I shall now prove from Anthon himself, in spite of his emphatic denial.

On April 3, 1841, seven years after his letter to Howe, and when he had probably

forgotten just what that letter contained, he wrote another on the same subject to the Rev. T. W. Coit, of New Rochelle, N. Y., from which I cull this paragraph:

> "On my telling the bearer of the paper, that an attempt had been made to impose on him and defraud him of his property, he requested me to give him my opinion in writing about the paper which he had shown to me. I did so without hesitation, partly for the man's sake, and partly to let the 'man behind the curtain' see that his trick was discovered. The import of what I wrote was, as far as I can now recollect, simply this, that the marks in the paper appeared to be merely an imitation of various alphabetical characters, [thus confirming Harris's 'Assyriac, Chaldaic, Arabic, and Egyptian' statement], and had, in my opinion, no meaning at all connected with them. The countryman then took his leave, with many thanks, and with the express declaration that he would in no shape part with his farm, or embark in the speculation of printing the golden book."

But it is not in this discrepancy alone that Mr. Anthon's memory fails to guide him aright. In his first letter he describes the contents of the paper as follows: "Roman letters inverted or placed sidewise were arranged and placed in *perpendicular* columns, and the whole ended in a rude delineation of a circle, divided into various compartments, arched with various strange marks, and evidently copied after the Mexican calendar, by Humboldt." As a matter of fact, the description fits in scarcely any detail. The characters were arranged in seven parallel

lines, after the order of Hebrew script, and without any suggestion of the perpendicular columns, the circle with its various compartments, or the Mexican zodiac.

Consider now what must have been Mr. Anthon's frame of mind when he wrote that letter. Naturally the first Mormon missionaries made much of this Harris-Anthon interview and its outcome, which they interpreted as the fulfillment of a prediction by Isaiah (29:11 to 14) which reads as follows:

> **"The vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee; and he saith, I cannot for it is sealed : and the book is delivered to one that is not learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee, and he saith, I am not learned. Wherefore the Lord said, For as much as this people draw near me with their mouths, and with their lips do honor me, but have removed their hearts far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precepts of men; therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvelous work among this people, even a marvelous work and a wonder: for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid."**

This 'marvelous work and wonder' was interpreted to be the restoration of the Gospel in its pristine fulness and power; in other words, "Mormonism." The book that was handed to the 'learned saying, Read this I pray thee,' was figured in Mormon dis-

courses to be the Book of Mormon; and the result of the attempt on the part of the learned to read it was held to be set forth in the phrase, "the wisdom of their wise men shall perish and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid," since the book was brought out by one that was not learned.

Think how galling it must have been to the pride of this New York savant, to be twitted by his academic fellows as one whom the Mormons named regularly in their sermons; an early proselyte; a man who had given the countenance of learning to religious vagaries that made the scurvy propagators of them the by-word of respectable orthodoxy!

Something of his state of mind breathes out in these letters; wherein he says that the same countryman came to him later with a "translation in English of the 'Golden Bible'," of which he desired to make him a present. "The more I declined receiving it, however, the more urgent the man became in offering the book, until at last I told him plainly that if he left the volume, as he said he intended to do, I should most assuredly throw it after him as he departed."

Think of the exasperation implied in this threat. Had his mind been normally sane,

surely curiosity if nothing else, would have prompted him to accept the book. He saw, however, no better way to relieve his feelings than to refuse it the harbor of his home. And he closes his letter to Mr. Howe in this characteristic fashion: "I must beg of you, as a personal favor, to publish this letter immediately, should you find my name mentioned again by these wretched fanatics."

Suppose now that Mr. Anthon had said and done, not all that Martin Harris claimed, —for it is well to allow something to over statement,—but substantially what was claimed; as he might readily have done in an early day, when no opprobrium could be imagined as attaching to his statements: would he or would he not take occasion to deny it later? Remember that by doing so he would not only be believed but applauded by those whose good opinion he courted; nor would he lose anything in self respect, since if he did say those things he would easily convince himself that he had been imposed upon. And what would be the use of admitting even a mistake? Especially as to do so would evidently be at the cost of popular ostracism.

Personally I believe strongly in the case as I have stated it; let the reader believe as

he is constrained. Suppose he decide in favor of Anthon and against Harris. Well, what of it? I protest against the use made of this incident to blacken the character of the Latter-day Saints. Mormonism is not responsible for the want of veracity in any man or set of men. The Gospel draws many a weak man into the fold; but it does not draw him by reason of his weakness, but because of some element of righeousness that his weaknesses have not choked out. Harris proved in many ways a sinful man; but his weakness never once took the form of impeachable testimony, and therefore he deserves to be believed,—with certain reservations as to verbal accuracy, which I have pointed out,—in this first important stand respecting the new dispensation of the Gospel.

THE MORMON POINT OF VIEW.

A Quarterly Magazine, owned and edited by N. L. Nelson, Professor of English, Brigham Young University. Price, $1.00 a year; single copies, 30c. Entered in the Postoffice at Provo City, Utah, as second-class matter.

Vol. I. Provo City, Utah, October 1, 1904. No. 4

A ROUNDELAY OF SALT LAKE.*

BY JOAQUIN MILLER, IN THE SAN FRANCISCO "BULLETIN."

Beneath our forty stars is she
The purest woman, sweetest, best.
Who loves her spouse most ardently
And rocks the cradle oftenest;
Whose home is filled, whose heart is fed
With halo of a baby's head.

How pitiful that we must pay
And pension man for killing man,
While woman brings forth as she may,
Unpaid, unpensioned, as she can;
Gives life while man takes life away.

Gives life, gives love because she must.
How sad that we must pension, pay

*During President Roosevelt's western trip, the various cities endeavored to out-do each other in honoring the distinguished guest. The women of Salt Lake City greeted the nation's chief with thousands of babes in their arms. The pink-faced infants cooed a welcome that must have filled his big heart with joy; and doubtless had be been called upon to decide which city had pleased him most he would have given the palm to Zion. In an address some time previous the President had expressed regret that the old-fashioned prolific American mother was becoming a thing of the past; and this it was which suggested to the Salt Lake mothers their unusual welcome.

Our tallest, bravest and our best
For killing brave men, east or west,
Until our race is in the dust,
As Greece is in the dust to-day;
A tomb of glory gone away.

I say the mothers of strong men,
Strong men and merry men and tall,
Must build, must man the Spartan wall
And keep it stoutly manned as when
Greece won the world, nor wrecked at all.
I say that she must man the wall.
The wall of breasts, unshielded, bare,
The wall to do, the wall to dare,
The wall of men, or we must fall.
I say that she, strong-limbed and fair,
Deserves the pay, the pension, care.

Of all brave, heartfelt welcomes found
Where flowers strew the fragrant ground
And rainbow banners fret the air
By city, hamlet, anywhere,
In Midland, Southland, Northland, West,
I reckon Utah's first and best.

Not guns to greet the nation's chief,
Not trumpets blaring to the sun,
Not scars of glory and of grief,
Not thrice told tales of battles fought,
Not seas of flowers at his feet,
Not bold to glitter and to greet,
But Utah brought her babes, and brought
Not one babe fretted or afraid,
Not one that cried or wailed, not one.
Oh, what to this the booming gun?
Oh, what to this the loud parade?
Proud troop to troop poured manifold
In battle banners rampt with gold?

Just babies, babies, healthful, fair,
From where the Wasatch lion leaps,
From sunless snows, from desert deeps,
Just babies, babies, everywhere;
Just babes in arms, at mother's breast,
And robust boys with girls at play,
With pounding fists, too full to rest;
As chubby, fat, as fair as they.

Behold you seas of alkali,
Of sand, of salt, of dried up seas,
Then shelter by these watered trees
And humbly dare to question why
These countless babes, these mothers, aye,
The maid in love, the lad at play,
All seem so gladsome, bright and gay?

Who tented here, who brake the sod,
Subdued the Artemisia's strength
With patient Ruth at ready call?
Who faced the red man at arm's length
And she beside him first to fall,
And while he prayed the living God?
Who gat such babes as never man
Had looked upon since time began?
And why? Because the loving sire
Loved life and hated low desire;
He loved his babes, he loved his kind
By desert waste of mountain wind;
He watched his happy babes at play
The while he gloried, glad as they.

This John the Baptist, naked, lean,
Lorn, crying in the wilderness,
This half fanatic, Luther, Huss,
Whom we once mocked in his distress,
Stands better than the best of us;
Stands nearer Jesus, God, because
He loves His babes, obeys His laws—
Becuase his hands, his feet are clean;
Because he loves his hearth, his home,
And patient heaps the honeycomb.

Behold yon million desert miles
With scarce a plow, with scant a tree,
Save where this desert garden smiles
And robust babes leap merrily!
Behold our boundless seas, as chare
Of sails as yonder peaks are bare!

Then give us babes, babes of your own,
My meddling congressmen and men
Of cloth, with great brains in the chin;
Glad babes like these to plow the seas,
Strong babes like these to plow or spin,
And let this Bedouin alone

Yea, give us babes at home, where now
Ye hide and house on every street
Such things as 'twere a shame to meet—
Glad babes to build and guide the prow,
Possess the isles, protect and bear
The star-built banner here—or there!
Till then, hands off, my Pharisee,
And tend your own affairs, as they,
Of Utah tend their own to-day,
Lest from the mouths of babes ye be
Condemned and damned eternally!

FOR CONSCIENCE SAKE.*

A Christmas Story.

A shadow hung over the little farm. Instead of the usual sounds of song and laughter there was silence. All went about their work sadly.

John Trueman, as was his custom, superintended the chores; but there was a sign of suppressed emotion, even in *his* strong face. His lips were drawn firmly together and ever now and then his hand trembled and impulsively his fist doubled tightly. He was evidently enduring a severe mental struggle. His voice

*This story was written by a young lady in one of my English classes in the Brigham Young University. I had encouraged her to enter the contest for a certain prize Christmas story, and when she asked me to suggest plot and atmosphere, I told her to draw upon the experiences of her own admirable home. That she has done so, accounts for the charming flavor of real life running through it. Not winning the prize, it is, by the author's permission, published here, and with a two-fold purpose: first, to supplement the leading article of this number by an aspect of Mormon family life purposely left out of consideration in that article in view of this story; and, secondly, to indicate that no true Latter-day Saint is ashamed of a past social relation which has given to Mormondom many of its noblest and brightest men and women of today.

way," said the father who overheard the last remark.

"Boys, are you about through? Harry, you better go and see that the cellar is well covered. It's going to be a cold night. Frank, did you give Blossom plenty of grain? If you are through milking, you better put the blanket on her. Lock the barn doors, Charley, and be sure to fasten the gates. I'll take the milk and go on to the house. Ned, can you bring the lantern?"

In the farm-house the same gloomy spirit prevailed. Emily and Clara prepared the supper in silence; Maud sat looking out of the window, her book lying unopened in her lap; noisy little Mary was silent; Sadie walked slowly up and down the floor with the baby; the younger children, Fanny Alice, Tom and Bob, sat in their little chairs, their heads on their hands, gazing earnestly into the bright fire.

Aunt Mary was in the bath-room sorting over the clean linen, while in an adjoining bed-room, Aunt Helen bent over the cradle of little sick Theron. Aunt Maggie passed quietly from room to room seeing to things in general: now filling the

was subdued, but there was a perceptible tremor in it, as now and then he directed the boys about their work. Few words were spoken but each face told that something had happened.

"It's a cussed shame," muttered Harry, as he climbed into the great loft to pitch down some hay.

"The dogs!" said Charley to Frank as they sat milking cows in adjoining stalls. "The scoundrels! It's an outrage on an innocent man."

"You mustn't blame the officers," replied his brother. They are only doing their duty. Blame the law."

"Yes, a fine law it is that won't let a man live quietly with his family, without being hunted down like a cur and thrown into prison. It's an outrage beneath the lowest savage."

"Wish I was a man," chipped in little Ned, who was holding Brock's tail while Charley milked. "You bet I'd show 'em how to take my Papa to prison. Say, don't you wish old Gray had got drowned that time he fell in the creek when he was hunting for Papa last summer?"

"Hush! my child, You must not talk that

tea-kettle or scalding pans; now taking medicine or hot flannels into the sick-room. They were all sad and thoughtful. Now and then the tears tickled down Aunt Helen's cheeks and on to little Theron's pillow.

Once Mary, with eyes flashing indignantly, said, "It's a shame! It's a mean, wicked shame!" and she gave the open fire a vigorous punch with the tongs.

Little Tom, who had leaned his head against the mantle-piece and gone to sleep, started at the unusual tones, and rubbing his eye said, "Say Bob, do you think they's any bears in prison?"

"What *will* we do without him?" asked Emily, and then even Aunt Maggie's lips trembled. Presently Brother Trueman came into the house. He set the milk on the bench, went out to the spout to wash his hands, then stepped softly into the sick room. Kissing Aunt Helen and kneeling down by the cradle, he took the little feverish hand and said:

"Papa's little man is better to-night, isn't he?" and the little sufferer looked up brightly at the sound of the familiar voice.

"Papa, when tin I see Toby?" asked the baby.

"I hope it won't be long, my pet. Toby is lonesome without Theron."

"Me 'oves Toby and you an' Mama."

Just then Aunt Maggie came in and laying one hand on her husband's shoulder and the other on the head of the younger wife, said,

"Now, Helen, you and John go into supper and I'll stay with baby."

As has been already intimated John Trueman was a polygamist. He lived on a comfortable farm, a few miles from O— in Southern Utah. His was one of those large families that lived in perfect harmony. He had three wives and fifteen children, and they were bound by the strongest ties of love and unity.

John Trueman was a plain man in appearance and manners, but he had a strong wholesome character, was a sincere Latter-day Saint, and an affectionate husband and father. He held duty and honor as the two guiding stars of his life.

Just now he was facing a circumstance that gave his character the severest test. Like so many of his brave and noble brethren, he had for years been persecuted, by what seemed to him, a cruel, unjust law:

and now for having been a man true to his family, he was, like some wretched criminal to be thrown into prison.

Late in the afternoon on the day our story opens, he had been arrested and was to leave home in just four days for an indefinite period of incarceration. He was willing to suffer for conscience sake, as so many of his brethren were doing, but just now the condition seemed doubly hard. His oldest son was on a mission to England, and Harry, the next, was somewhat wild and reckless, knowing little of responsibility. Baby Theron lay suffering with typhoid, and some of the other children were just at an age when they most needed a father's counsel and guidance. His heart ached when he thought of leaving them,—perhaps for years; but he had accepted his cross bravely and looked to God for strength and comfort.

II.

"Judge, I'm afraid you've made a devil of a mess of that Trueman affair."

"Why, what's up now?" asked Philip Strong, looking over the top of his paper

at Deputy Gray who had just entered the parlor.

The two men had been on one of their raids in Southern Utah and were staying over night in a hotel at O—. Gray was as vile a character, as the scum of the Mormon-haters could produce. Strong was a lawyer, honest and fair-minded, who not thriving in his profession, had accepted the office of deputy U. S. Marshal, during the period known as the Raid. It was through Strong's influence that John Trueman had been given a few days' grace, owing to the sickness of his child, and had been left to report on his word of honor.

"What's up?" repeated Gray.

"Well, I'm afraid he's going to skip to-night. Donald reports some suspicious movements. This morning one of Trueman's boys came tearing up to the Bishop's on that fast horse of theirs, and Don saw them hold an excited council. Then the kid hurried back to the farm. You know Ashby is no friend of ours, and I'm dead sure something's in the wind."

"No, Gray, John Trueman, Mormon or not, is a man of his word," answered Strong.

"I'm not so sure. These 'cohabs' are d—d tricky cusses. I wish we hadn't been so easy with him. But here comes Donald. Any more news?"

The new-comer, a recent law graduate, was on a visit to Judge Strong's and had accompanied the officers just to "see the Mormons in their dens." Seating himself and stretching his legs before the open grate he answered:

"The kid's dead. Died in the night, so I heard a man say in the store."

"He'll sure slope before morning then," resumed Gray.

"*I* say, he will keep his word. Besides, do you think he would miss his baby's funeral?" asked Strong.

"Any how, I think it would be safer to look around a little to-night. We can't be sure of that kind of game till they're under lock and key."

Deputy Gray then seated himself, lighted a cigar and having gazed a few moments at the burning logs, broke into a fit of laughter. His companions looked up inquiringly. "And so, Don, you've lost your heart to the little Mormon gal? Oh, you're on to your job, alright. Just

help us get the old man out of the way and then steal the girl. Ha! ha! ha! the nephew of Judge Strong in love with a polygamist's daughter!"

"Who said I was in love with her?" retorted the young man testily. "I simply passed my opinion that—what did you say her name is?—was a deucedly pretty girl and that it was a cussed shame she was in such a family."

"Don't be too free and easy with Mormon girls, young man" counseled the Judge. "These people are rather fanatical about Gentiles, and it might not be safe to play the gay, young Lothario, here."

"Much obliged for your advice, uncle; but you just watch me take care of myself—and her, too, if I want to."

The probability that John Trueman would give the officers the slip was then discussed at length, and it was decided to be on hand that night at the ranch, should he attempt to do so.

* * * * * * * * * * *

The word brought to the village store had been only too true. Little Theron, growing worse and worse in spite of the loving hearts and anxious faces around

him, died about one o'clock the night before.

Aunt Helen was heart-broken. Was this her babe, her beautiful darling? And would she never more hear the prattle of his little tongue; never more feel the soft pressure of his little arms about her neck or his rosy cheeks against her own?

For a time she refused to be comforted. Like all young mothers enduring their first great sorrow, she forgot that other souls have suffered.

Aunt Maggie and Aunt Mary laid out the cold little form in the parlor, and had scarcely finished their gentle service when the grief-striken mother entered the room, supported on the arm of her husband.

Raising her sad eyes and meeting the gentle sympathetic condolence of the older women, Helen seemed to realize for the first time that other hearts had throbbed and bled as her own was doing now. Her heart melted with sudden love at the sight of this unobtrusive sympathy; for what bond is so strong as that between mothers who have suffered kindred sorrows?

"John," said Aunt Maggie, who in the days long ago had also lost her first born, "leave us alone, dear."

What a picture they make—those true women clapsed in each other's arms at the head of the dead child.

"Helen, there are things worse than death, things in comparison with which death seems sweet. Do not grieve, he is happy. See how peaceful he looks. Do not make him unhappy by your sorrow."

Thus did one unselfish woman, made noble and strong by a life of daily self-sacrifice, console another, younger and less experienced.

How slowly that sad night passed. The great clock in the dining-room solemnly ticked the weary hours away, and at last morning dawned. But how lonely and quiet it seemed.

Friends came to the farm to help prepare the little one for burial and about four o'clock in the afternoon a quiet funeral was held.

How beautiful the choir sang,

"Your sweet little rose-bud has left you,
To bloom in a holier sphere."

And how soothing were the words of hope and comfort which fell from the lips of dear Bishop Ashby and kind old Brother Adams.

But after little Theron had been laid in the frosty ground, and they had returned home, the house seemed more still and dreary than before, every one saw how lonesome the little cradle looked.

* * * * *

It had hardly grown dusk when three men moved cautiously along a wild hedge near John Trueman's barn.

"They must have done their chores," whispered Gray. "I don't see any of them around."

"Hush! there he comes now."

Slowly and with bowed head, John Trueman made his way toward the barn. In one corner of the corral stood a fine mare, which neighed at his approach. Behind her was a half-grown colt, which came up to him to be petted.

"Toby, Toby," said the man brokenly, putting his arm around the colt's neck, "did you know your little master is gone? He will never pet you again. Will you miss him too, Toby? O my baby!" and the strong man broke down and wept.

"Let's go," whispered one of the deputies. "We are not needed in such a place."

"We can't now," responded Gray, "and

besides, I'm not so sure that there won't be something doing yet."

When John Trueman returned to the house, the traces of his dark hour alone were gone, and he was prepared for the consolation and counsel which he felt he must give to his family on the eve of his departure.

What a picture they make there in the ruddy firelight, sad and thoughtful, under the great trials that hang over them. The younger children have been put to bed. Let us glance, individually at the members of this sacred family council.

To begin with, there are the wives: Aunt Maggie the first, so good and noble, beloved as a mother by all the children. Her hair is streaked with gray and there are lines of care and sorrow on her calm brow, but her face still has that sweet expression—so full of love and kindness for everybody,—that has made her the friend to whom they all take their troubles. Aunt Mary is sweet-tempered and quiet, a good mother and a loving wife. Aunt Helen is young and beautiful. She still has many of her girlish ways and leans upon the older women with a confiding, beautiful simplicity.

Then there is Emily, whose gentle face tells of patient resignation to suffering and disappointment. She is the 'old maid' sister, Aunt Martha's girl, and Aunt Martha has been dead for years. The older children have a faint remembrance of a lover who went away in the days gone by, but that is all. They know there is something sad about the story and have learned not to mention it as it always brings a look of pain to Emily's face.

Next is Harry, good-looking and jolly, though considered by some of the neighbors a little rough.

Then there is Frank, staid and trusty, his father's right-hand man; and Charley, about the same age, energetic, but very quick-tempered.

Next comes Clara, always so womanly and quiet. She is to be married in the spring to Dick Ashby, the Bishop's son.

Then there is rollicking, fun-loving Mary, whose black eyes are always dancing with pent-up mischief. She is almost seventeen now, but enjoys as much as ever a good romp on the hills in the summer, or a snow-ball fight in the winter.

Maud, the prettiest daughter, finds her

greatest pleasure in books. She is loving and lovable, and her simplicity and sweetness have made her the pet of the family. She has just turned sweet sixteen and gives promise of a nature which, when fully developed, will be capable of the most intense emotions.

Nor are we the only spectators of this sacred family reunion. Crouched by a low window on the east side of the dining-room, the officers, accompanied by Donald Lester, have looked in repeatedly and then at last been held as by a spell of strange fascination, listening to the words of love and comfort which are spoken from heart to heart. Gray still clings to his view and the trio remain to demonstrate whether or not he is wrong.

At last the hour has come to retire. The family Bible is taken from the shelf and a chapter is read by Emily. Then they all kneel down together. Though their trials are heavy, it is a grateful prayer that ascends to the Father's throne.

The words of devotion come to the listeners outside. With a sympathy, child-like in its directness, that servant of God renders thanks for past mercies, and for the present blessings and privileges.

They hear him plead with a touching fervor, for the Father's watchcare over his family during his absence. He asks that their needs be supplied and their hearts cheered.

How earnestly he pleads for his grief-stricken wife, that she may be comforted and strengthened. Here a sob reaches the ears of the men outside and even Gray seems to be swallowing something hard.

The father prays for his absent son that he may always be guided aright and return home in safety.

Most earnestly he pleads for his children at home; that they may be strong against temptation.

He asks for strength to bear his own great trial; for wisdom and fortitude.

"Come, I can't stand this any longer," said Strong rising from his cramped position. "Let's go."

"It *is* a d—d low business we're in," said Gray as they walked slowly toward the village. "I never felt so much like a cur in my life."

For a while Donald Lester was silent. Then his thoughts found their own utterance.

"By Jove, that girl is an angel—let her be what she will—Mormon or Gentile. Did you ever see such eyes!"

III.

Two years have passed since John Trueman went to prison. There have been many changes in the family at home.

Clara is married and has a little home of her own.

Aunt Helen has become somewhat reconciled to Theron's death and is teaching school in O—. She stays with Clara in town, but comes home every Friday evening to visit with the folks.

Quick-tempered Charley has left home. He couldn't agree with the other boys and just before the last 4th of July, he ran away. Aunt Maggie has aged very much since then, and though she tries hard to keep up her spirits, there is something touching in her very cheerfulness.

Harry has surprised everybody. As the head of the family, he has accepted his responsibility like a man.

It is the evening before Thanksgiving. The people of O. are preparing for a great public feast.

Darkness is just falling as Emily,who has been to town working on the committee, returns home. She at once calls Harry out onto the front porch and makes room for him to sit beside her on the step. She sits so long, staring blankly into space that at last Harry breaks the silence.

"Well, Emily, what is it?"

"Harry," she answers, "I want to talk with you about a very particular matter. There is something you must help me do. You can not do it alone nor can I, but we must do it.'

"Well?"

"Do you know where Maud is?"

"Why, no. Is anything the matter?"

"Listen, brother: Tonight just when we had finished decorating the hall and I was taking Sister Jones' hammer home, I saw Maud turn the corner with a strange man. Harry, it was Mr. Lester."

"What, that d—d scoundrel back again?" and Harry sprang to his feet, clenching his fists.

"Harry," said his sister taking hold of the young man's arm, "sit down and listen, for we must do something."

"Do something! Where is the rascal?"

"I say, sit down and listen. You must act discreetly."

Well, go on," and the impetuous boy tried hard to control himself.

"As soon as I was over my first shock, I hurried in the direction they had gone, and saw them go into the grove by the old schoolhouse. I couldn't make up my mind to go and try to get Maud, nor could I leave her there with him, so I just stood and listened and, Harry, tomorrow night they are going to run away."

"The black-guard! I'll shoot him this time, sure," and he sprang again to his feet, white and trembling with rage. "Where is the *dog?*"

"Harry, Harry, listen to me," pleaded his sister. "You have failed once with Maud. Perhaps it was your sternness that led her to this step. Let *me* try this time. Let us see what love and kindnes can do. I felt that I must tell someone, and I knew it would almost kill Aunt Maggie, so I told you, and you must help me, brother. I will talk to her tonight,-and, O Harry, we will pray and hope. O, how I wish Papa were here!"

"Hush, there comes Maud. Remember not a word now."

That night when the house was still, Emily stole softly to the door of Maud's and Mary's room.

"Maudie," she whispered.

"What do you want?" was the answer with a slight tremor that told the girl had not yet been asleep.

"Come into my room, will you, dearie? I want to tell you something."

When they were seated alone, Emily began,

"Maudie, I want to tell you a story—the story of my own life. I was not always the quiet old maid that I am today. Once I was young, and some of my friends said, pretty. I had a lover then, sister, and I loved my Will with all the devotion of my young heart.

"He was handsome and bright and full of ambition. We were to be married in the fall and were going to California for a while, where Will would work for his uncle.

"How happy I was that summer preparing for my wedding! I used to sit sewing

and singing all day long, with mother and Bessie helping me.

"It seemed that mother could hardly bear the thought of my going away. Often when I sat building castles for the future, her dear eyes would fill with tears and her sweet lips tremble. But I was so wrapped up in my own love and happiness that I forgot all else.

"It was just three weeks till we were to be married, when one day mother fell from a chair on which she had tried to reach a high self. The fall hurt her back and she never walked again. Day after day she grew weaker; and when the doctor told us she would never get well, it almost broke our hearts.

"And then the day she died,—I shall never forget it. It was one of those golden Autumn afternoons. The sun shone in mellow streams through the curtains on her sweet pale face. Father, Bessie and I were in her room. She asked papa to raise her in his arms while she talked to us. Little Bessie and I knelt beside the bed. She put a hand on each of our heads and said with voice as sweet as an angel's.

"'My darling, your mama is going to

leave you; but do not grieve, for I shall be up there with the angels and wait for my loved ones to come. You must try to be a comfort to papa, and make your lives good and happy.'

"Then she took my face between her two white hands and said, 'Little girl, I want you always to be happy, but, remember, I leave little Bessie to you, and you must take mama's place. Do what you know is your duty and God will always be with you.'

"As she put her arms around little crippled sister, the tears welled into her dying eyes, it seemed she could not bear to leave this tender little flower behind her.

"'O mama, mama, I want to go, too," sobbed Bessie.

"Mama looked at me. 'I will remember, mama,' I said, and with a smile that I shall never forget, she leaned her head on papa's shoulder, and her spirit left us.

"This was the first great trial we had ever known. Papa sat so pale and still looking at her sweet, white face. Little Bessie clung to me and sobbed the whole long night. I felt crushed, and yet there was also a new feeling which came with mother's dying smile, a feeling of responsibility

that I had never known before, and I resolved to *do my duty.*

"Time passed. Aunt Maggie came down from G— to live with us. I did not try to like her nor her children—my own little brothers and sisters. I was too selfish in my sorrow. I lived only for Bessie and Will; but then came the most cruel test of all.

"About a month after mother's death, Will wished to be married. He said he had sent word to his uncle and must go. What could I do? I loved him dearly, but I could not leave Bessie. She would die without me, she was so fragile and tender.

"'O Will,' I pleaded, 'let us wait a little while. I cannot go now and leave Bessie. or else let us marry and settle down here.'

"'You do not love me, Emily,' was Will's answer; and then. I hardly know how it happened, but we had a bitter quarrel. He was young and proud, and within a week left home. I have never seen him since.

"I thought he loved me and would come back—"

The girl paused to get control of her voice. Maud impulsively threw her arms around her older sister and wept with her.

"But he never came," resumed Emily in a tone of resignation. "A few times I heard of him in California; then learned that he had gone to Europe, and so the only man I ever loved went out of my life.

"Two months after this, little Bessie died, and I was indeed a sad, sad girl. I shut myself up in my grief and refused to be comforted. Father was kind and loving, and Aunt Maggie tried to be, but I would not let her.

"Hour after hour I spent in the little churchyard, praying to die; for what had life in store for me now?

"One night after I had cried myself to sleep, I had a dream of mother. A light came into my room. It grew brighter and brighter, and when I looked up, mother was standing beside me. She was all white and beautiful, but she looked down at me with such a sweet, sad light in her great blue eyes, that I knew she was grieved at my sorrow. I wanted to speak,—I wanted to go to her arms but could not. She looked at me for some time, then turned and was going away.

"'O mama, mama, take me with you,' I sobbed stretching out my arms. She came

back to my bedside and bending over me whispered the one word 'Duty.' Then she kissed me and went away.

"I understood. There was a duty yet in the world for me. Yes, mother, I would find it.

"From that night I have been happy. I have found many duties,—hard ones, too,—but it seems that our angel mother is always near to help me.

"Sister, it is by doing our duty that we learn to live. Every one has some stern duty—a test in life and, Maudie, I believe yours is standing before you now."

Tears were streaming down the young girl's cheeks.

"O Emily," she sobbed, "you mean Donald."

"Yes, I mean Mr. Lester, Maud, and I want to help you to see your duty," answered the older sister.

"Let me tell you all about it, Emily. For months my heart has been aching for someone to help bear its secret, but you all misjudged Donald so, that I dared not breathe his name.

"When I first saw Donald, the time he helped take papa, I hated him; but the

next Summer when I met him at Etta's and he explained it all to me, how he was acting against his will, I learned to respect him; and then, O Emily, I can't tell you how it came, but before I knew it I loved him dearer than my life. He was so handsome and cultivated, just like heroes in books, and then to think he loved me—a simple little country girl.

"I shall never forget the night he told me of his love. We walked home from town. It seemed that the brook sang sweeter, the moon shone brighter, and all earth was dearer than ever before. We were standing under the old apple-tree, and the moon stole softly through the leaves, and the air was sweet with the scent of the blossoms. I remember the very light in his large dark eyes as he took me in his arms and kissed me and told me that I was dearer than the world to him.

"I think no one was ever so happy as I. I could not sleep, but lay looking at the great white moon that peeped in at my window, saying over and over in my heart, 'He loves me! he loves me!'

"You will remember what happened the next day; how Harry came in and com-

manded me never to think of that villain again; said he would shoot him if he ever came back, and called him all the low down things he could think of. O, sister, it seemed like my life was crushed. I had not a friend in the world to soothe my bleeding heart. You were all of you *bitter, bitter cruel!* And then when Donald wrote and told me how he had been wronged, and begged me still to love him, do you wonder that my love grew stronger? He was the only friend in the world who could understand me.

"And now he wants me to go with him, to his home. Of course I know it would be wrong to do as we have planned. It would break mama's heart and poor papa in prison, what would he do? But I didn't think of that. I knew that when you once know Donald you will all love him; and I thought we could come back after awhile, and it would be all right. Donald has promised to study the Gospel, too, and I feel sure he will join the Church.

"But, Emily, you have shown me that I have a duty and I will do it. Of course, I won't need to give Donald up; none of you would have me do that, if you knew

him; but I will explain it all to him, and we will wait till he is better understood."

"Don't you think I had better explain it to him," suggested Emily. "You see *he* might think differently about it, and it would be harder for you."

"O no; I couldn't think of such a thing. You need not fear. He loves me so dearly and is such a gentleman, I'm sure he will see it is for the best when I explain it all to him."

"Very well, dear. Trust in your Heavenly Father, and I will pray for you, too. Now you had better go to bed."

And with Emily's tender kiss upon her lips, Maud was soon in dreamland. Ah, unsuspecting heart, little do you dream of the snare that lies before you!

IV.

It is Thanksgiving evening. John Trueman is sitting in his dimly lighted cell trying to read his Bible. But somehow his mind presists in turning homward. He wonders what they are all doing tonight. He pictures his dear ones, his wives and children; the young people are perhaps now preparing for the dance in town.

He sees the boys bustling around. They

must be ready early to go for their partners. The group is not complete. There is a twinge at his heart strings as he wonders where Charley is tonight.

Then there are the girls: Mary, jolly as ever, teasing Sadie who has promised to go with Dill Thomson; Emily, busy as usual helping the others; now tying a sash for Sadie, next adjusting a ribbon for Mary, or combing Maud's hair.

The man's face begins to glow with the picture. Yes, there is Maud his prettiest daughter. How beautiful she looks tonight, her dark eyes are bright and clear and the pink of her cheek is deeper than usual.

As this detail flashes acros his mind, suddenly the familiar room, in the old home fades away and there stands Maud alone. Before her, and scarcely a step away, yearns a deep, dark chasm. There is a wild, uncertain look in her eyes, yet she does not seem to see her danger. So vivid is the vision that he gives a sudden cry of alarm, and the picture vanishes.

Long he sits there pale and trembling. What can it mean? He tries to analyze the feeling. He reads his last letters from home. There is nothing unusual in them.

Perhaps it is nothing but fancy after all; and so thinking he goes to bed.

But he has been asleep only a little while when suddenly he starts up. There before him in the dark cell is that terrible picture again—Maud alone, by that awful pit.

A dreadful foreboding now comes over him. He springs from his bed, and kneeling on the cold stones, pours out his soul to God for the protection of his loved one.

Still that heavy dread. He prays again for an assurance of his darling's welfare, and as thus he kneels, he feels his spirit leave his body, which falls senseless on the hard floor.

V.

How busy they all are on the little farm. It is the day before Christmas and Father and James will be home tonight. What a jolly time they will have! Harry and Nellie have decided to be married on Christmas day, so there are more preparations to be made than usual.

On Christmas-Eve, however, they will have a good old family party. Frank and Ned have brought home the Christmas-tree and are fixing it up in the parlor.

Harry, Dick, Mary, and Sadie are decorating the long dining-room, with evergreens and the mistletoe that grows so abundantlv on these southern hills. Alice, Fanny, Tom, and Bob are making bright chains and popcorn strings for the tree, while Aunt Mary, Aunt Maggie, Emily, and Clara are busy in the kitchen.

And what rows and rows of pies, cakes, puddings, and cookies are being stored away! There are panfuls of horses, elephants, and soldiers; also some well-browned Santa Clauses with great packs on their backs,—for what would Christmas be without these?

Maud is still kept in the invalid's chair, yet she is helping Aunt Helen with some mysterious work in the bedroom. Harry has brought two great boxes from town and carried them in; but the door is always closed with such precaution, that the children would give almost anything to get just a peep inside.

"Here, Dick, that mistletoe isn't in the middle," said Mary.

"Now, Miss Prim, I'd like to know who's doing this? I guess if George catches you under it, it won't make much difference

whether it's straight or not. It will serve the same purpose won't it, sis?" answered her brother-in-law, pinching her cheek teasingly.

"Now, Dick, behave yourself. I don't see how Clara ever stands such a torment."

'I wonder what surprise James has for us? I can't imagine what it can be," said Harry. "If it wasn't for Grace, I'd think he was bringing a wife home."

"Perhaps he hasn't heard of Nellie, and is bringing one for his brother," suggested Mary with a shy wink.

"Do you think papa will know where to come?" asked Tom. "I bet he'll git lost on that new road you fellers made up by the four acres. Hadn't me an' Bob better go up an' wait for 'em, so we can show 'em which way to come?"

"I's a doin' to show papa the ittle 'ams," declared baby Rose.

"No you're not! They're mine and I've got a right to show 'em," said Bob.

"I'll show 'im the tittens, anyhow," persisted the little miss nodding her curls.

"Isn't it about time they were coming?" Aunt Helen went to the window for the

fortieth time. "It's almost four o'clock, and it's beginning to snow again."

"Oh, here's George and Nellie and Grace." Sleigh bells were heard coming up the road, and Mary hurried away to receive the guests.

The afternoon passed and evening came, but still papa and the missionary had not arrived. The fire was roaring and crackling up the great chimney. The children were popping corn, while Emily told them the old sweet story of the babe in the manger.

Maud, pale and pinched from her long sickness, sat in the warm firelight, her head leaning back on the cushions. Her eyes were closed, yet there was a firmness around her delicate mouth, that told of a lesson in self-denial well learned; an expression possessed only by those who have been strengthened and fortified by victory in a great conflict with self.

Grace sat with folded hands gazing thoughtfully into the fire, dreaming no doubt of the lover she was soon to meet.

Mary and George were together in the bay-window while Harry and Nellie sat

on the sofa in the chimney corner, planning for the future.

The wives, with Clara, Dick, and Frank, were in the parlor finishing the tree.

Why didn't they come? It was almost eight o'clock and still snowing. Could anything have happened? Each tried to suppress his excitement, but that was getting to be impossible.

Hark! Old Tige gives a sharp bark and bounds from the porch. There is a sound of wheels. They stop. There are heavy stamps upon the step. A dozen hands rush to open the door and in one instant, father and son are surrounded by loved ones.

When the first excitement had passed, James put his arms around Emily and drew her towards a tall stranger who stood unobserved in the doorway.

"Here is my surprise," said he,and twenty eager glances were turned in that direction.

For one moment Emily stared at the visitor and then with a look of joy cried, "Will!" and was clasped in the stranger's arms.

"Oh, I'm so glad," said Mary throwing her arms around Grace. For years their heart had ached in sympathy with the hid-

den sorrow, for their older sister. Indeed, no surprise could have been more grateful to this bevy of boys and girls just in the age of romance. Maud cried outright in the fulness of her joy.

"Yes, my boy, take her," said John Trueman, crossing over to where the reunited lovers stood. "All these years she has waited for you."

"It has all been a cruel mistake," said Will Burton looking fondly into Emily's glowing face. "I heard you were married to Jack Kelsey,—you know you used to go out with him—and didn't learn that it was your cousin Eve, until I met James at the mission headquarters in London."

A little later when the first excitement had somewhat died away, and they were all seated around the fire, Brother Trueman laid his hand affectionately on Maud's head. She looked up with such a beautiful light in her eyes and said,

"O Papa, it was you who saved me. I wanted to do right, after Emily had shown me my duty, but, Papa, I was just yielding, I was just going to tell him I would go, when I felt a strong arm draw me back, and looking up I saw you standing by me.

"I wasn't afraid, but felt so good and strong. Then I told him, Papa, that I would not go, and the look he gave me revealed his character. With an awful oath, he turned and left me, and I fell fainting to the ground, where I lay till Emily came and found me there."

"Sister," said Emily, "you didn't know how Harry and I stood near, watching, and praying for you, nor how hard it was for Harry to restrain his impulse to seize the villain by the throat, nor how at last he conquered himself and followed Lester to town and made him start for the depot that night, with the warning never to show his face in this country again."

Then the father told of that night when his spirit left his body; and while he could not remember anything that happened, yet when he came to himself, he was filled with a strange feeling of peace and joy.

How shall I describe the mirth and hilarity which rang out along the happy lines of that long table—the welcoming home of the father and son, husband and brother; the merry jokes hinging on associations past, present and to come,—allusions that

brought the warm flood of life to the cheek, the sparkle of joy to the eye!

There was only one face in that joyous group which needed to feign a look of gladness. Nobly did Aunt Maggie sustain her difficult part. And when she withdrew it was under cover of serving the rest.

But John Trueman saw her go and knew the reason. As soon as he could do so he joined her in the parlor. There they stood lovers as of old, ready to share once more each other's sorrows, even on this long looked for night of joy.

"Don't grieve too much,Margaret. Let us believe that the Lord is watching over him and will bring him back to us."

"I can't help it, John. He was our youngest—and—and—I know the Lord is good, but—O John, it's so good to have you home—"

And the dear patient woman claimed once more the old joy of weeping away her grief on her husband's breast.

Before retiring that night the reunited family sang that dear old hymn

"God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform."

And once more around the family altar they

poured out their thanks to God, for his blessings; nor did they forget to ask him to protect the absent wanderer and guide him safely home again.

What a sweet, holy influence filled that home; the joy of Christmas tide was in every heart.

As John Trueman stooped to kiss Maud good-night, she put her arms around his neck and whispered, "Papa, I, too, have found the joy of suffering for conscience sake."

Eglantine.

WHAT CONSTITUTES THE MORMON FAMILY.

"How many children have you?" asked a member of the Congressional committee.

"Forty-two," was the reply; "Twenty-one boys and twenty-one girls, and I am proud of every one of them."

No doubt the answer surprised and amazed the grave and reverend seniors of the senate, who silently drew comparisons between such a family and their own empty, or comparatively empty, mansions; it certainly served to set the whole country agog with astonishment and curiosity.

No incident, however, in the life of President Smith,—full of courageous precept and example though that life has been,—appeals more subtly to the pride of manhood and womanhood among Latter-day Saints nor re-enforces more strongly their sense of devotion to the most sacred duty man can owe to God and the human race.

President Smith's is *one* type of the Mormon family—a type from which have come some of the purest, noblest, and most forceful of the men and women now at the head of affairs throughout Mormondom. But it is not necessarily *the* type. However, before generalizing the characteristics which constitute the essentials of the Mormon family, it may be well to consider briefly some of the notable examples.

In an interview published April 25, 1903, in the Salt Lake Telegram, the following facts and statistics were brought out respecting the family of Hon. Lorin Farr of Ogden, Utah. Mr. Farr was born in Vermont in 1820, and married his first wife, Nancy Chase, in 1845; he married five other wives, as follows: Sarah Giles, 1851; Olive A. Jones, 1852; Mary B. Freeman, 1854; Nickaline Erickson, 1857; Clara J. Bates, 1901. The last named was 81 years of age when he married her, and died without issue the following year. She should not be counted in the family for statistical purposes, as she was probably merely sealed to him in view of the life hereafter.

By his first wife President Farr had twelve children, forty-six grandchildren

and twenty-one great-grandchildren, or a total of seventy-nine; by his second wife he had nine children, and fifty-one grand children, or a total of sixty; by his third wife he had seven children, and from three of these, fifteen grandchildren, or a total of twenty-two, three of the children having died without issue; by his fourth wife he had six children, and from four of these, twenty-four grandchildren, or a total of thirty, the issue of two children not being known; by his fifth wife he had six children and twenty-eight grand children, or a total of thirty-four, one son being unmarried at the date of this interview.

Summing up these numbers it will be seen that Lorin Farr, at the age of eighty-three, had forty children—twenty sons and twenty daughters and one hundred and sixty-four grand children; as to great-grandchildren, only the statistics of two or three families were at hand, but the number was estimated at fifty-six, making a total of two hundred and fifty-eight descendants during a little more than half a century. Adding to this number the two hundred and twenty-seven descendants of Aaron and Winslow Farr, brothers of Lorin, it will be

seen in what a practical way, these three sturdy pioneers made the desert blossom as the rose.

Another family illustrating the Mormon ideal of family life is that of Nahum Curtis, a descendant of the Mayflower colony, who joined the church in 1833. He had six sons and one daughter, three of whom married after reaching Utah in 1850. Two of the sons, George and Moses, and two of the grandsons, lived in polygamy, each having two wives. These are the only cases of plural marriage in the family; and yet when a census was taken one year ago, it was found that there were 466 direct descendants of Nahum Curtis still living.

An illustration of the effect of ideal upon fruitfulness, occurs in connection with the family of Emma Whaley who became the first wife of George Curtis in 1850. She bore her husband seven children, and these have already increased to forty-one grand children and great grand children, making her descendants forty-eight. She had two brothers and two sisters who also emigrated from England to America, attracted by the desire to better their financial conditions. One sister joined the church but died short-

ly afterward without issue. The combined descendants of the other three equal just eighteen. That is to say three members of the family, acting upon a worldly ideal, had an average of six descendants each in two generations; the other, inspired by the Mormon ideal, had forty-eight descendants. In other words, she was eight times as fruitful as they. What is still more significant, is the fact that, while not wealthy, all her descendants own their own homes, and are well to do and thrifty, while the descendants of the non-Mormon branches of the family are perpetually in straightened circumstances.

The Cluff family presents another remarkable example of fruitfulness. David Cluff of New Hampshire and his wife, Betsy Hall of Canada, reached Utah valley in 1850, with ten sons and one daughter. The latter was the only one of the children married and she had two children. Fifty years later, that is, in 1900, a census was taken and the number of descendants found to be over six hundred. Most of the families have been monogamous, there having been only eight cases of plural marriage.

The original family, of whom David Cluff

was a member, consisted of four girls and five boys besides himself; yet the combined descendants of all the other children, none of whom accepted the Gospel, did not equal ten per cent of David's descendants in 1900.

The monogamous families of the Church will average in number of children just about like the respective families of President Lorin Farr, above quoted; viz., twelve, nine, seven, and six. To be conservative, however, let us put the number at from five to twelve for each mother. The families with fewer than five children will be found almost as rare as the families with over twelve.

I am speaking now of true Latter-day Saints, those who conscientiously and fearlessly accept God's command, "Multiply and replenish the earth." We have among us, however, for the time being, families who are wavering between the Mormon ideal and that of Babylon, and others,—further along in the process of sloughing,—who have quite gone over to the followers of the Malthusian ideal. But even allowing for these, Mormonism presents a creditable showing as compared with the rest of civilized mankind.

Taking the United States as a sample of the enlightened world—it really stands best in the column of western nations so far as 'race suicide' is concerned—and the average family is equal to five and one-half souls. As against this, consider the status of the average Mormon family, which is equal to seven souls. The comparison means simply that in the world it takes two sets of parents to produce five children, while in Mormondom this nummer is produced by one set. The average Mormon parent is thus seen to be twice as prolific as the average Gentile parent.

What this shall signify in a wider social sense, and during future ages, will be discussed later. Here let us abstract and generalize the essential facts respecting the Mormon family. At first sight the central fact would seem to be the begetting of children; as if salvation were somehow dependent upon the number brought into the world. Such a conclusion, however, would be both true and untrue, according to the point of view taken.

Paul in characterizing the Roman nation as ripe for destruction, mentions among many other sins that 'even their women did

change the natural use for that which is against nature.' It may be asked, what is the 'natural use' of the procreative relationship between man and woman? There can be but one answer—procreation. Any other use, at least to the extent that it interferes with this natural function, is changing the 'natural use of the woman for that which is against nature.'

Mormonism recognizes the first divine command given to Adam and Eve, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it," as being still the foremost social law to mankind. Part of its fulfillment is the begetting of children. Motherhood is consequently looked upon as the right and duty of every well-born woman, and fatherhood of every man worthy a standing in the Church. Measured against this holy purpose of marriage the gratification of lust is debasing and sinful, and marks a very low order of manhood and womanhood.

It is not, therefore, that the Latter-day Saint makes everything else bend to the begetting of children; he rather makes everything bend toward social chastity, toward the curbing and subduing of that heritage

of lust which has descended upon him, as upon the rest of mankind, from a thousand unbridled ancestors. Increase in the number of children is the natural consequence of such a course. For to the extent that he and his wife succeeded in marital continency, to that extent is motherhood relieved of obstacles to the fulfilling of God's command. If, therefore, Mormon women have more children than non-Mormon, what is it but indisputable proof that both they and their husbands are more truly respecting and honoring the 'natural use' of marital intercourse?. What this fact means in its reaction upon character will be seen in a later chapter.

From another stand-point, however, it is most true that Latter-day Saints welcome children to the home; and feel that the more God sends to them the more are they blessed. It is easy for the Mormon woman to understand, from her religious point of view, why the mother in Israel should have felt so keenly the sense of reproach which accompanied barrenness, and the sense of joy and rejoicing which came to her when God made her fruitful. But this aspect I also reserve to treat elsewhere.

The Mormon family may be defined, therefore, as the natural, untrammeled family,—the family which results when the fountains of life are not diverted to satiate unholy desires. But bringing children into the world is only half of the divine command. Observe that God said not only, "Be fruitful and multiply," but also "Replenish the earth and subdue it." This latter part is fulfilled only when every child brought into the world is fitted to do its share of the world's work; fitted to replenish its industrial army, and help subdue its deserts and wildernesses.

Accordingly, among Latter-day Saints a spirit of industry is enjoined upon all. "There shall be no drones among you," said the Lord in a revelation to Joseph Smith. Again: "Six days shalt thou labor," said Jehovah amid the thunders of Mt. Sinai; and this first half of the divine command is held to be just as sacred and binding as the second half. The thrift of the Mormon people is consequently proverbial. Perhaps ninety per cent of all its families own their own homes. For instance, the combined wealth of the 466 descendants of Nahum Curtis above referred to, is estimated con-

servative at one million dollars, and is pretty evenly distributed among them all. How thrift and industry are related to moral character, I shall refer to again.

It is not polygamy, then, that is the essential fact of the Mormon family as a social factor; for, as above pointed out, this ideal consists in the natural, the untrammeled birth of children, and their careful bringing up for social service. Indeed, polygamy unaccompanied by these characteristic phases, would have no excuse for existence that a Latter-day Saint could possibly countenance. And this thought leads me to point out directly what was,—and is, for that matter,—the need of plural marriage as an adjunct in the social evolution of Mormon family life.

Grant that every woman fitted physically and otherwise for the divine mission of motherhood, has a right to bear children,—a right God-given and inalienable; and grant further,—what must ever be the case with the true Latter-day Saint,—that she conceives the begetting of children to be a solemn duty, the consequences of which will reach into eternity; how shall she exercise

that right under laws that "forbid to marry?"

The argument that the sexes are born about equal in number has but a shallow, surface significance. Many men are disabled, or unwilling to marry; and it is a notorious fact, at least among us, and I think also among mankind at large, that the percentage disqualified for family life by thriftlessness and vicious habits, is always greater among men than among women. At any rate, noble women pause at the thought of taking such men to be the fathers of their children.

From such a variety of causes (coupled perhaps in many cases with the congenital fact of plain-favored face or form), many pure, high-minded young women are left old-maids in nearly every town throughout Zion; young women who are the peers of the very best among their married sisters, and whose issue could not fail to improve the human race.

What shall these good women do? In Mormondom, from force of religious training, they are all of the Evangeline type, maidens who look forward to a loved union which shall round out their lives to the full-

ness which God intended; or like Whittier's sister, whom the poet describes as

"The sweetest woman ever fate
Preverse denied a household mate."

They may teach school; paint flowers; make themselves cozy dens, sorrounded with animal and vegetable pets; travel, lecture, write books; perhaps grow old and wizened as family servants, but even under favorable conditions, is it not most pathetic to see the juice of maternity drying up in them, till they become all but sexless, often misanthropic and cynical, rarely sweet and mellowed by age, like the adorable grandmothers who were school-mates with them?*

*"There is not one woman in a million who would not be married if she could have a chance. How do I know? Just as I know the stars are now shining in the sky, though it is high noon. I never saw a star at noon day; but I know it is the nature of stars to shine in the sky. Genius or fool, rich or poor, beauty or the beast, if marriage were what it should be, what God meant it to be, what even with the world's present possibilities it might be, it would be the Elysium, the sole, complete Elysium of woman, yes, and of man. Greatness, glory, usefulness, await her otherwheres; but here alone all her powers. all her being, can find full play. No condition, no character even, can quite hide the gleam of sacred fire; but on the household

Mormonism provided a way whereby all true women within its fold might escape such a fate. The number that entered polygamy was always relatively small—could not be otherwise, from the simple fact that you cannot marry more women than there are. Talk about plural marriage menacing the so-called American home! Get down to figures, will you, and determine how many women would by any possibility be available for plural wives. Only those left over because their birth mates were unwilling or unworthy to marry them.

Mormon plural marriage was never a menace to monogamy. It was merely a safety-valve for the pressure of internal social evils. It took up the old maids which are now accumulating in our wards and stakes; it arrested that contingent which

hearth it joins the warmth of earth to the hues of heaven. Brilliant, dazzling, vivid, a beacon and a blessing her light may be; but only a happy home blends the prismatic rays into a soft, serene whiteness, that floods the world with divine illumination. Without wifely or motherly love, a part of her nature must remain enclosed, a spring shut up, a fountain sealed."—Gail Hamilton.

now directly, or through marital failures, finds its way to gilded palaces of sin; and it permitted such a choice of sires as prevented the thriftless and vicious from perpetuating their undesirable progeny.

Then came our mis-guided brothers and sisters of Babylon, with the Malthusian ideal of family life, to break down our barriers and turn loose among us the sexual evils which now curse the world. They succeeded; but in my humble opinion at a tremendous cost to the social evolution of the race. Had their prejudices permitted them to be sane, they might at least have stood by for a generation or two and observed this experiment in family life, which Mormons believe to have had essentially in it the social healing of the nations.

It is now too late, however; the institution as once upheld and enjoined by the Church is gone. If examples of it occur in the future,—and on this point let it be borne in mind that social institutions are neither made nor unmade in a day—they will be the sporadic outcroppings of individual initiative, and maintained in secrecy, under the obloquy alike of Church and Social circle. I state this most confidently on the basis

that the practice now contravenes a fundamental tenet of Mormonism: viz, "We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates, and in obeying, honoring and sustaining the law." Our struggle to maintain the institution came to an abrupt end as soon as the enactment of Congress against it was pronounced law; that is to say, the Manifesto discontinuing plural marriage was promulgated immediately upon the final interpretation of the law by the Supreme court. As to relations formed before the Manifesto, a higher law than any possible legal enactment on earth —the law of Anglo-Saxon manhood—will take care of them, let the consequences be what they may.

But let no one believe, because plural marriage has been discontinued, that the Mormon family ideal has been obliterated. With the exception of a certain quota of women left childless because they can find no mates, and another quota among whom are the victims set apart for the altar of lust,—human waste product—which enforced monogamy always entails upon any race or people, and which Charlotte Stetson Gilman estimates to have constituted, un-

til now, about one-third of the marriageable women of the race,—with these exceptions, vastly minimized however among Latter-day Saints, the Mormon family will go on to its necessarily revolutionary consequences.

II.

ESSENTIAL BASES OF THE MORMON FAMILY.

But before taking up these consequences, let us see whether the prediction that the Mormon family will go on, is well founded; in other words, let us investigate the basis of this new unit of social life, and see how deep and firm it is.

It is a noteworthy fact, in every civilized country, that the large families are invariably associated with the industrial classes; that is to say, with men and women who are naked to nature, as it were, because stripped by stern necessity of those conventional shams and artificialities which wealth brings. The usual explanation of their fertility is that they are ignorant of the devices for preventing offspring.

That the poor and humble are thus innocent of the sexual vices of the rich, may in-

deed be true; but it is a most significant fact that they show little inclination, while so living next to nature, to acquire them. And the reason is self-evident: the life they lead preserves sweet and wholesome the natural race instincts. Fancy a working woman cuddling to her breast a beribboned poodle, or being ashamed of any phase whatever of maternity!

The real growth of the Mormon ideal in family life began with their exodus, when, driven from their homes in the central states, they were forced to live in tents and covered wagons during the long and painful journey across the plains; and afterwards when remote from the arts and trades of civilization, each settler was compelled, without intermediary agency, to get food and clothing and shelter directly from the soil. Here in the heart of the American desert, during nearly a quarter of a century, the Mormons received such a baptism in the wholesome environment of natural life, that the God-implanted instincts, blighted or sicklied over for generations by the conventions of society, grew strong and sweet again. And which instinct, let me ask, should, under normal

conditions, be more virile than love of offspring?

The deepest source of the Mormon family ideal is therefore that which they had in common with all natural peoples. Thank God then for the hardships which released our mothers from the bondage of fashion; which took them out of the "boudoir" with its pastes and cosmetics, into garden, field, and orchard for nature's own pinks and browns; and which, instead of the "teas" and "at homes," the "high-fives" and "euchre" parties, with their vanities and meddlesome insipidities, made it necessary for them to keep time with the clock far into the night, carding or spinning, knotting or weaving, darning or sewing, for rosy-cheeked darlings, lying perhaps on straw mats here and there about the one living room, their clothes beside them like so many heaps of rags. What a sight was this to warm and fertilize the maternal heart! Pray God that even such hardships may come again, should we forget the lesson in character which they imparted.

I repeat, the most basic source of the Mormon family lies in the wholesomeness

of affection which Mormons have in common with all children living close to nature. But this source is ever in danger of drying up to the extent that wealth shall take away work; for no woman can love children unless she has to do for them. The society dame may weep over a little half worn shoe which her bejeweled fingers have never put on nor ever taken off; but we instinctively feel that she is acting, and inwardly have only contempt for her crocodile tears. The divine law that love is ever conditioned upon service holds here as well as in other matters of religion. Considering then that the day of poverty for most Latter-day Saints has disappeared, or is fast disappearing, we may well ask will the Mormon family gradually go with it?

Were the unreasoning instincts its only support, it might, indeed, it must, if the lessons of history are to be trusted. But Latter-day Saints have other supports. The Presidents of Cornell and of Harvard might appeal in vain to their respective graduating classes not to avoid the responsibilities of family life; for at best the basis of their appeal must be racial altruism, a very uncertain quality at this stage of man's

spiritual evolution. Not so with appeals made to Latter-day Saints; for these find response in the deepest emotions of the human heart; duty to God and hope of salvation and exaltation in the life to come.

The source of this religious belief lies primarily in the command given to our first parents to be fruitful and multiply, a command held to be just as sacred in our day as any in the decalogue; and the whole tenor of scripture is such as to emphasize the blessedness of obeying it.

"Children," says the Psalmist, "are an heritage of the Lord: and the fruit of the womb is his reward. As arrows are in the hands of a mighty man: so are children of the youth. Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them: they shall not be ashamed but shall speak with the enemies in the gate." Again: "Thy wife shall be as a fruitful vine by the sides of thine house: thy children like olive plants round about thy table. Thus shall the man be blessed that feareth the Lord."*

Where faith is strong, that is to say, where men and women have an abiding, ever-present testimony that God lives, a divine command is the end of all contro-

versy. God has said it, and the spirit bears testimony that it is right. The doing of it, therefore, even though its ultimate bearings are not fully understood, brings that peace and joy which soon come to be recognized by the spiritual-minded as the benedictions of heaven. It was such ardent faith, such simple, unquestioning trust in what was right and blessed, that facilitated the rearing of "Bible families" in the days of ancient Israel. The same faith and trust would suffice to reinforce the natural desire for children among the "gathered Israel" of today.

But this faith and trust no longer rests on the mere *ipse dixit* of a divine command. Latter-day Saints now realize that giving birth to a child is no mere trifling with the physical forces of procreation, but the most tremendous event that can take place in the whole range of their creative free agency; viz., the furnishing of a mortal tabernacle for a being eternal as God himself and therefore inherently capable of becoming perfect as his Father in heaven is perfect. To refuse maternity is therefore to refuse hospitality to a child of God warm with the blessings of heaven upon its head as it is

sent earthward to begin its second estate; to hinder its entrance upon mortality is nothing less than seeking to block the way in the psychic evolution of a soul. It means that a man and a woman, after being themselves generously piloted into the dark valley, through which all souls must pass in order to be saved, would now turn round and close the gate upon their companions of the pre-existent world. Could ingratitude be more basely selfish than this?

And therein lies the damnation of it; for selfishness, be it remembered, no matter how euphonious the names it may pass by on earth—is the one quality in nearly every sin that stands always in the way of eternal life. Approach to salvation is ever in the ratio of self-abnegation. What is salvation itself but the complete triumph of altruism? It is on this basis, then, the basis of self-sacrcifice to the end that the purposes of God may be fulfilled, that the bearing and rearing of many noble, God-fearing children, is a means of salvation and exultation.

The argument is sometimes advanced that a man's glory and dominion in the hereafter will be in the ratio of the num-

ber of spirits born under his lineage. Stated thus baldly the doctrine has always seemed to me selfishly pharisaical: as if one should say, "I am holier than thou, because I have done thus and so more than thou." And the impression made upon the minds of intelligent investigators cannot fail to be the utterly repulsive one that degrees of glory in the 'Mormon' heaven are won on the basis of fine breeding qualities on earth. And with such a notion, is it any wonder that they say our religion is "egregiously materialistic?"

Let us therefore look more narrowly into this argument. If heaven is to be a commonwealth characterized by perfect social harmony,—and what else could be heaven? —then it is conceivable only along the lines of a perfect organization of society on the basis of absolute truth. Such an organization would involve both rulers and ruled, in all degrees of co-ordination and subordination; in other words, it would involve the "dominions, principalities, and powers," spoken of by Paul, and the "priests and kings unto the Most High," referred to by John the Revelator.

Now, on what score is it conceivable that

men will attain to honor and dominion in the kingdom of heaven? Not manifestly on the basis of the number of wives and children they may have, but on the basis of absolute character and fitness to rule. But what will constitute that character and fitness? What life on earth will have developed the qualities necessary to dominion in that heavenly society? Will it be the life that refused to obey God's first command?

The mere physical act of cohabitation is a mark of selfishness rather than of unselfishness; but whether the motive be selfish or unselfish is to be judged by the issue. If it results in a home barren of children, to the end that it may be full of luxuries, then in God's sight the human pair guilty of it must be monsters of selfishness, however they may be rated by society on earth for intelligence and culture. Think you His rulers will be chosen from such as these?

On the other hand, if the act result in "children like a flock," and those children, moreover, are reared to do God's work in the earth, what can be greater evidence of unselfish character? There have doubtless been Mormons whose crass notions of ex-

altation have led them to bring children into the world with all the irresponsibility of rabbits; but such families, while perhaps *in* the Church are never *of* it. Nor are they in it for more than one generation: their progeny have no more cohesion for the life of sacrifice demanded by Mormonism than so much thistledown. They will be found anywhere but in the kingdom of God.

The Mormon doctrine of eternal dominion as related to posterity, implies that such posterity shall, through the training of parents, be saved in the kingdom of heaven. Think what a life of unselfish love and devotion, what a ceaseless vigilance for truth and right, a Mormon family saved implies in the father and mother of that family.

To be the father of forty-two children, twenty-one sons and twenty-one daughters, by five different mothers, is nothing noteworthy from the mere physical point of view; but to rear such a family with the love and harmony that prevails in President Smith's homes, implies a character for social control on the part of the parents, which to say the least, is very extraordinary. Now, suppose the time had come for God to choose from the sons of earth a man

fitted by well-tried judgment to settle the difficulties in an ideal society, on the lines of love, patience, long-suffering, justice, impartiality, what monogamist living the selfish ideals of the world, could stand the test with the polygamist who brings up five families of noble sons and daughters to bless his name?

The doctrine that glory and dominion in the hereafter are related to the number of a man's posterity will probably hold therefore; but its advocates should be careful to qualify it by the condition that the rearing of such a posterity shall have resulted in a God-like character; and not forget to add that failure in this regard leads rather to hell than to heaven, and with a descent accellerated by how many spirits he has brought into the world to damn his name.

Bringing forward my theme again, I may remark that the perpetuity of the Mormon family and its ability to resist the Malthusian ideal, is assured not only on the basis of instinct, reinforced by the sanction of religion, but also by the Mormon conception of patriotism and duty to country. Listen to the ringing words of President

Lorin Farr, the patriarch referred to in the opening chapter:

"The best citizen, the greatest patriot, is the man who loves the institutions of his country and obeys its laws, and who at the same time brings into the world and educates the greatest number of men and women to follow his example.

"The people who refuse to become parents are never satisfied. They are seeking a pleasure they cannot find, because they are shirking their most sacred duty. The man or woman who is afraid or unwilling to take the responsibility of becoming a good parent, is not fit to discharge the other duties of citizenship. The husband who wilfully and knowingly neglects to perpetuate his race is not a good man, and I would not shake hands with him as a brother.

"President Roosevelt is exactly right on the score of big families, and he'll find his opinions sustained by all good men regardless of party. Almost all true, noble-minded men and women want large families. Some can have none at all. I am sorry for them. Small families are better than none at all, but I do not believe in them. Suppose you have one or two children and you lose them through disease or accident. Then if you are old how will your lineage be perpetuated?

"The man who does his duty to his God,

his country, and himself should bring into the world, care for, and educate, the largest family he is able to."

It will be seen that President Farr makes the duty of rearing a large family threefold: A duty to God, to country, and to self. These divisions, however, are really only different aspects of the supreme duty of man to work out his own salvation. God's purpose in creating this planet was to furnish a new environment, a "second estate," for the education of his sons and daughters. The carrying out of this purpose is conditioned upon man's fulfilling the first great command. God's next purpose is so to conserve and evolve the good among mankind that out of the confusion of Babylon, shall gradually come the order of the Millennium, and that, too, on this earth. Man helps to accomplish this purpose when he brings into the world a multitude of good citizens; for what is good citizenship but promoting justice, the virtue which shall make the Millennium possible? God's final purpose is to save mankind. This is possible only by surrounding them with an ever progressive environ-

ment, which, successively over-come, shall by its reaction develop in man the attributes of God himself. One stage of this environment is what I have called the Bible family. Man's duty to himself is not to shirk any situation the mastery of which will add to his honor and glory; and what other experience could possibly compensate in character-formation for the loss of fatherhood and motherhood in the true, untrammeled sense in which God ordained them?

III.

CONSEQUENCES IN EXTENSION.

"The upright," says Solomon, "shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it; but the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." Darwin told the same truth in a later day when he announced the law of the survival of the fittest.

Writers on sociological subjects do not hesitate to vindicate the wisdom of Solomon in this passage nor the scientific accuracy of the conclusion by Darwin, so far as the degenerate classes are concerned. Dr.

McKim, a recent writer on "Heredity and Human Progress," takes the ground that nature refuses her sanction to the perpetuity of the defective in the human race; among which he includes, first, the idiot or lowest manifestation of human degeneracy; second, the imbecile, or weak-minded who is incapable of caring for himself. Third, the epileptic, or person not in control of his nervous organization; fourth, the habitual drunkard; fifth, the criminal, or moral degenerate.

"All individuals in civilized society," says McKim, "are—to some degree degenerates: through a weak and vicious ancestry, the seeds of degeneracy have been scattered broadcast and may, anywhere, develop into the rankest luxuriance; but as a rule it is along special family-lines that we find the notable phenomena of degeneracy: insanity, idiocy, imbecility, eccentricity, hysteria, epilepsy, the alcohol-habit, the morphine-habit, neuralgia, 'nervousness,' St. Vitus' dance, infantile convulsions, stammering, squint, gout, articular rheumatism, diabetes, tuberculosis, cancer, deafness, blindness, deaf-mutism, color-blindness, and a number of other abnormal

conditions less well known to the lay public. ...The history of these families usually shows on accelerating intensification, generation after generation, of the fatal heritage until they have become extinct."

The author proceeds to illustrate this last fact, by citing well authenticated families, and tracing their swift descent to extinction in some instances in the third, in others in the fourth and fifth generations. Then he adds: "It is a matter of congratulation that there are thus removed, eventually, many of those who are utterly unfit for human society. But this desired end is usually reached only after some generations of miserable lives; and the taint of the decaying stock is by no means always eliminated when a family has been brought to the brink of annihilation. A man of a fast waning stock, heavily laden with inherited weaknesses, marries a woman of healthy and vigorous descent, and, behold, the family name is rescued from extinction. But at what a cost! ....It is in this way that from time immemorial the threads of vicious inheritance have been woven into the web of the human constitution."*

*Heredity and Human Progress, pp. 65 to 70.

Nature, which is only another name for the will of God, can have no permanent sanction for the weak, the corrupt, or the vicious. Eventually she sloughs them, as a tree does a worm-eaten branch; and the very place where they once hung on is obliterated. We are now to bring into this same category, men and women who pride themselves upon being the cream of the race; the rich, the haughty, the exclusive, who look down upon the toilers among mankind—as the *proletariat.* In mental and physical equipment they cannot be classed among the defectives, yet they are degenerates all the same. Their sin is that of utter selfishness.

"By the sweat of thy brow, shall thou eat thy bread," said the Lord to the emancipated Adam. Whoever despises this law, the law of personal contact with nature, cannot be kept sweet and wholesome, but must soon be given over to "unnatural affections." Such in fact is the curse that falls upon the idle rich. Around them grows an atmosphere of sham and artificiality called fashion, which, however it may dazzle the would-be imitators in the working statum, cannot fail to be an abomination in the sight

of the Ordainer of Nature. And so it happens that these, too, drop out of existence in a very few generations.

In illustration of this thought I cannot do better than quote a recent editorial of the Deseret News commenting upon an article by Lydia K. Commander in the New York Independent of April 14, 1904:

"It contains [says the News] an array of evidence, gathered from the most authentic sources, and showing the decadence of American stock, the decline in the American birth-rate, and the open avowal of physicians and others as to the suppression of offspring. The calculation of Benjamin Franklin, who, by the way, was one of fourteen children, as to what would be the population in 1900, is quoted, that is, 100,000,000; which was based on the average family of his time, namely eight. The actual population is but 76,000,000, of whom 11,000,000 are foreign born and 13,000,000 the offspring of foreign born parents leaving but 52,000,000 for American stock, or little more than half the number predicted.

Investigating the effect of the announced prejudice of landlords in New York against renting houses and flats to people having children, the writer of that article found that in large numbers of families renting

there were no children at all, and in many others but one child. Pursuing the inquiries, the writer visited forty-six physicians; several declined to discuss the matter, but thirty-six responded, and out of these thirty answered the question: "What do you consider the ideal American family," by saying, "Two children, a girl and a boy." One of them actually declared that, "Having a family is not an American ideal," and further remarked: "Among my patients I find that the majority do not want any children; certainly not more than one. I should say that as a rule the second is an accident, the third is a misfortune, and the fourth a tragedy."

Another physician said: "The desire to limit or eliminate family is universal. Children are no more, or scarcely more, desired among the poor than among the rich, though the poor are often less successful in avoiding them. I am consulted professionally in regard to this every day." Another remarked, "Whenever the woman of the poorer classes is the least bit above the lower level, she desires to cease having children. No request is made of me oftener in the clinic than for advice along these lines." Fourteen other physicians having clinic experience confirmed those opinions. We have not space or inclination to quote the numerous instances cited on the subject, but refer the reader to the article in the In-

dependent, which is summed up as follows:

A review of the evidence gathered points to these conclusions:

1—That the size of the American family has diminished.

2—That the decline is greatest among the rich and educated, but also exists to a marked extent, among the middle class and the intelligent poor.

3—That only the most ignorant and irresponsible make no effort to limit the number of their children.

4—That not only has the large family disappeared, but it is no longer desired.

5—That the prevailing American ideal, among rich and poor, educated and uneducated, women and men, is two children.

6—That childlessness is no longer considered a disgrace or even a misfortune; but is frequently desired and voluntarily sought.

7—That opposition to large families is so strong an American tendency that our immigrants are speedily influenced by it; even Jews, famous for ages for their love of family, exhibiting its effects.

8—That the large family is not only individually, but socially, disapproved; the parents of numerous children meeting public censure.

The Independent editorially deplores but does not deny the statements and conclusions of the article from which we quote.

It endeavors to promote a desire for honorable and prudent marriage, however, and for large families of healthy intelligent children. It argues that "many of the very best women who would make the best mothers remain unmarried because there are not enough good and worthy men to provide them husbands." And it declares, "The fact is that there are two good, pure, high-minded women to one such man." And further, "Many such women do not meet the man worthy of them who can seek them in marriage, and they will not marry a man whom they cannot respect." If [concludes the News] these remarks had been made by a 'Mormon' writer, he would at once be suspected, if not accused, of advocating polygamy."

In placing the upper extreme of society in the same category with the lower, as respects the tendency to extinction, let me not fail to note one important difference. In the case of defectives, the inability to perpetuate the family is organic; that is to say it grows out of feebleness, or perverted physical powers. In the case of fashion devotees, barrenness results from wrong standards of life; in other words, from perverted mental powers. It is not that the rich and well-to-do could not have large

families; it is simply that they *will not* be so "disgraced"(!)

Mormon communities are peculiarly constituted to prove the last-named fact, made up as they are of broken families from thousands of more or less illustrious but, alas, fast disappearing lineages. The founders of the three families noted in the opening chapter, and hundreds like them throughout the Church, are descendants of New England, and have close relatives today among the exquisites of Boston and other eastern centers of culture; than which same exquisites it would be difficult to find more typical examples of racial dry rot.

And yet these Mormon descendants, these disgraced scions of many a "respectable" Puritan family, are today among the leading exemplars of the Bible family ideal. Does it not seem as if the accumulated race instinct, long repressed by the demands of "culchaw," has at last burst through its artificial barriers, and is now reaching its full flood tide among the despised dwellers of the Rocky mountains? Leaving only the mud and debris of a stagnated "has been" to the few dainty lingerers

on the sites of its once populous and dominant family hearths!

Nor is this contrast less pronounced when families, the descendants of English parents, compare births with uncles and cousins left in the old world. Whence it may be pertinently asked, Is it possible that influence of ideal is responsible for such disparity in fruitfulness between parallel branches of the same family tree? Latter-day Saints can hardly be persuaded that this is the only factor at work. They believe literally that "children are the heritage of the Lord;" but more of this question anon. The immediate purpose of the present chapter was merely to forecast in general some of the social changes which are inevitable should the Mormon family go on.

It will hardly be denied that the tendency in the United States, like that in some of the countries of Europe, is, as President Roosevelt says, in the direction of race suicide. The statistics commented upon in the editorial above quoted, will be recognized as exhibiting the essential truth respecting other communities than New York. There is little use denying the fact: the American

family is a decadent family. The natural life itself represents a magnificent river gradually losing itself in the sands of an ever-widening desert of shams and conventions.

Against this tendency Mormonism is but a small stream at present; but it is a living, sparkling, natural stream, flowing in the opposite direction and gathering volume and momentum by every rill and brooklet. Let these two tendencies continue and it needs no prophet to foretell that the American family of the future will be the Mormon family, despised though it be at the present time.

And this transplanting of the living for the dying is one which the rage and hatred of mobocracy cannot prevent. The tide of Mormon life has too many estuaries for anything short of total extermination to close. Let the rabid wardens of degenerate Christian cults face this situation squarely. They may still poison the minds of men and women in the world, so that the vitalizing truths of Mormonism shall be disregarded, and our missionaries come home as empty handed as they went out; but they cannot control the resistless tide of the

heavenly emigration. Against this influx of Mormons they can only gnash their teeth in despair.

The "American home" which figures so frequently in the fervid denunciations of Mormonism, is fast becoming a trite metaphor; that is to say, it is a thing fast being embalmed in the mere embellishments of rhetoric—and in need of such embalming. Long before it shall be quite mummified, however, the restored American home will be here; the natural, untrammeled home, in which there shall be mothers, not dames of fashion; and children, numerous as in the days of Franklin, and expecting no other legacy than the brain and brawn of manhood and womanhood,—not as now a weazend pair or trio eyeing each other with distrust while waiting for the post mortem division of a miserable patrimony.

"The upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it; but the wicked shall be cut off from the earth and the transgressor shall be rooted out of it."

IV.

RESULTS IN EXTENSION CONTINUED.

Without being a prophet or the son of a prophet, I find, on re-reading the last chapter, that I have been prophesying good about the Mormon family and its future. I hasten therefore to review the basis on which I have ventured the prediction. This basis is two-fold: first, the persistence of the Bible ideal of family life among Latter-day Saints, or the triumph of race altruism; and secondly, the persistence in Babylon of the Malthusian ideal, or the continued triumph of race-destroying selfishness.

As to the first of these factors, I am aware that all has not yet been said in a negative way, and I shall therefore advert to it again. On the positive side, however, the evidence for the persistence of the ideal seems clear. The race instinct for children is normal at present; and owing to the probability for two or three generations at least, that Latter-day Saints will be for the most part a pastoral people, and so be moulded by regenerative contact with na-

ture, this instinct bids fair to grow in power rather than decrease. So, too, the religious support for the natural family, is sure to grow stronger, as men investigate more deeply the mystery and meaning of mortal probation; while duty to the race, which includes patriotism and love of country, will as it becomes more and more an object of religion, also find its noblest expression in transmitting the torch of life with a crescent rather than a waning brightness.

Let us now examine the basis of the prevailing ideal of family life in the world. In the country, especially on small farms, and wherever wealth has not accumulated beyond the need of daily labor, nor decreased to a point where labor barely suffices for subsistence, the natural instinct for children will take care of the race, even though not reinforced by religious or ethical motives; and herein lies the safety of our beloved commonwealth. Compared with free open areas of human activity, the city is only a vast race cemetery for the overflow population of the country.

For one generation perhaps after entering the city, the race instinct for children

remains normal; but before it can assert itself, it must live down a peculiar variety of temptations. There is first the lust temptation. As this is frequently the sole immediate inducement to marry, so the base pleasure of it is naturally inimical to procreation. Next there is the desire to escape toil and drudgery. The large family becomes appalling to the inexperienced husband and wife, when measured by the care they have been devoting to a first child. Then many a young married pair have an ambition to get rich quickly, and so grudge their substance to their own flesh and blood. But perhaps the most subtle temptation is that presented by social functions. Women lose their girlish figures and other marks of beauty, which hitherto have fed their vanity. Men must give up their clubs—an 'awful bore.' And so it happens, especially in the second generation, the instinct for children grows at length so feeble that the family of two—a boy and a girl—becomes the ideal. Often, as the New York physician put it, the second of these is an accident; and so far from desiring more, these married worldlings would regard the third a misfortune, and the fourth a tragedy.

Nor is it difficult to understand how the desire for children, which normally should be the strongest race instinct, dies altogether under the influence of modern civilization, especially in cities. The transformations wrought by invention have left sacred no tradition of social life. Time was when the ambition of every substantial American was to found and perpetuate a noble family; society has now veered completely round to the divorce court ideal. Homes are fast being supplanted by flats, with no provision for children; firesides and home circles, by theatres, concert halls, clubs, and dens. So fast and furious has become the race for wealth and pleasure, that children are everywhere a hindrance. Even work which ordinarily should bring its blessing of naturalness to the worker, has been so specialized in industrial centres as to add to the artificiality of life. Men no longer get glimpses of the natural history of things they make, eat, or wear. They are mere cogs in a wheel, making their little rounds in the darkness of a man-created world, far from the glorious sun and stars and the wholesome reactions of the universe. And so with no support from re-

ligion, and duty to race a mere book sentiment, small wonder that love of offspring for my conviction that the Bible family, as life which comes in contact with nature only at last in a childless, unloved grave!

Such then, in general, are the grounds for my conviction that the Bible familiy, as upheld by Latter-day Saints will be the dominant type in the America of the future. Mormons will not give up their family ideal, as long as it is supported by a living, virile faith; the worldly-minded, having no such faith, will shirk the responsibility, undeterred by appeals to race patriotism. Both ideals will thus reach the inevitable results by vastly accelerated movements: the dominant ideal by its tremendously increased power, generation after generation, for making converts; the decadent ideal by its loss through conversion of those families which would otherwise have kept up the ratio of increase.

Supposing, however, that the relative increase in population remains the same as now; viz, two and one-half for each set of parents in the world, and five for each set among the Latter-day Saints. Beginning with a population of 80 millions for the

RICKS COLLEGE
DAVID O. McKAY LRC
83440

United States, the increase for ten generations would be as follows: first 100 million; second, 125 million; third, 156 million; fourth, 170 million; fifth, 212 Million; Sixth, 266 million; seventh, 332 million; eighth, 440 million; ninth, 551 million; tenth, 662 million.

Compare with this the growth of the Latter-day Saints for the same time, beginning with a basis of 300 thousand. First generation, 750 thousand; second, 1 million, 785 thousand; third, 4 million; fourth, 11 million; fifth, 29 million; sixth, 73 million; seventh, 183 million; eigth, 457 million; ninth, 1144 million; tenth, 2861 million.

The result in ten generations would thus be as 2861 millions to 662 millions in favor of the Mormon ideal; that is to say this ideal will dominate the other as four to one, within a period of time less than that which has elapsed since Columbus discovered America. Blessed be the people who array themselves on the side of nature! All the powers of the universe are behind them.

Ten generations, however, is a long time, from the human point of view, to wait for

a people to veer around again to natural conditions. Personally I should have been willing to see this regeneration helped forward by the assistance of plural marriage. It would not have helped much in the aggregate,—only to the extent that good women now denied families—would add to the regenerative forces; but looked at from the point of view of individual family lines, the results would be surprising enough. Elder A. M. Musser, for instance, makes the following unique comparison: "If Ex-President Cleveland's five children should each be as prolific as their father, his posterity in six generations would be 15,625; President Roosevelt's by his six children would, for the same time, be 46,656; A. M. Musser's 35 children by four wives—20 sons and 15 daughters,—would, were each son to be as prolific as the father and each daughter as her mother, make his descendants equal, in six generations, to 64,885,735 souls! Verily, 'The little one shall become a thousand and the small one a nation.'"

But a population of 2861 millions plus 662 millions, or a total of over two and one-half billions, is an incredible population even for the United States. In these calcu-

lations the supposition was that the ratio of increase remained constantly two and one-half per married pair in the United States as a whole, and five per married pair among Latter-day Saints. As a matter of fact such a ratio takes no acount of deaths before the age of nubility. Consequently we shall need to revise the results very materially.

In a study on the growth of population Mr. Grant Allen a few years ago reached the conclusion that in order to keep the race stationary in numbers, it is necessary for every married pair to have four chilrden. This estimate was based partly on the growing disinclination to marry on the part of many men, and partly on the study of the death rate among minors. At first the need of four births from each marriage seems unduly large, considered merely as the means of keeping the population even; but when one looks around and discovers the proportion of men and women in every community who might but who do not marry, and reflects upon the heavy mortality among children, and the deaths from war and accident among adults, the estimate will be seen to be about correct.

In a paper on "The Family" read by Professor Howard of Chicago University before the world's congress of science and arts at the St. Louis Fair, the point was made that owing to improved sanitation and hygiene, a greater proportion of the children born are likely in the future to reach the marriageable age, than have done so in the past. To be entirely safe, therefore, let us put the number of births necessary to keep up the population, at three instead of four per family. This still leaves the United States as a whole on the decadent side of population, the births being but two and one-half per family. Instead of advancing in numbers, the population is retrograding at the ratio of three to two and one-half, or as six to five in each successive generation. Should no change come to disturb this ratio, the decrease in 350 years or ten generations, beginning with a population of 80 millions, would be as follows: first generation, 66 millions; second, 55 millions; third, 46 millions; fourth, 38 millions; fifth, 32 millions, sixth, 26 millions; seventh, 22 millions; eighth, 18 millions; Ninth, 13 millions; and tenth, 11 millions.

In the face of the recent tremendous growth in the population of the United States, no American would give his assent to these figures. Nevertheless, if our country had been under the necessity of depending solely upon the blue-blood stock of certain old families, a decadence somewhat like this would already have taken place; and were the future in the hands of those people who now limit offspring to one or two children, this result would be inevitable. But America is too rich a country to languish for population, even though the old world be half depopulated in consequence. Nor need we look to foreign sources for keeping up an increase in our ranks: Latter-day Saints are Americans. Let us proceed to note what would be the growth of population among this people, under the Bible family ideal, for the next ten generations.

Of the five children in each average Mormon family, let us allow one for the death rate below the age of nubility. This is a much smaller ratio than that exacted in the other calculation, and is justified on three considerations: (1) the Latter-day Saints, being active propogandists, may be

be, the Mormon family will go on, undisturbed by his academic prophecies. Beginning with a population of 300,000, they will have reached 38 millions by the sixth generation as against the 26 million descendants from the United States as a whole, and 614 millions by the tenth generation, as against 11 millions, the remnants of those who believe in the present small-family ideal.

Allowing one hundred million for the foreigners drawn to America and their descendants, and we have approximately a population of three-quarters of a billion people; none too great for the resources of our marvelous country. But lest factors unforeseen have been left out in this calculation, let us cut this estimate in two, or even in four. The influence of the Mormon ideal will still be as six to one in that future day. What is more immediately to the point, however, that influence is at work now, small in its power, perhaps, and narrow in its field, but still on the ascendant scale. *It is the only ideal that carries national greatness within its womb.*

expected to increase largely by conversions, (2) As all Latter-day Saints hold it a duty to God to rear an honorable family, very few comparatively will shirk the responsibility of married life; (3) the death-rate among Mormon children will, for reasons to be discussed in the next chapter, be much lower than in the United States at large.

Four children to the family that live and reproduce, constitutes the simple geometrical ratio of increase, viz, two, four, eight, sixteen, thirty-two, etc., that disturbed the Rev. Thomas Robert Malthus so mightily, and led him to write the famous treatise,*

*"Essay upon the Principles of Population as It Affects the Future Improvement of Society." The leading idea of this work is that the population of the earth increasing steadily in geometrical ratios, the world must soon be over-populated; and that unless means to check such increase be promptly adopted, the nations of the earth must soon be brought to the verge of starvation. Malthus' remedy was abstinence from marriage; needless to say, believers in his theories have found other means of accomplishing the same result.

which has since served as moral shield for all who take it upon themselves to curtail their offspring. As Latter-day Saints are not among his followers, nor ever likely to

V.

RESULTS IN INTENSION.

The fact that any given people shall outgrow and survive any other people with which they may be in competition, is *prima facie* evidence both by Scripture and by science, of their innate fitness to survive. I might therefore rest my argument for the superiority of the Mormon ideal on just such a broad conclusion as this; but I prefer to show this same truth in detail, by considering the inevitable reactions of this ideal in character formation.

To understand and appreciate the part Latter-day Saints are probably destined to play in the social evolution of the future, it will be well to glance at the constitution of the present stock and their immediate predecessors. It is now over seventy years since the Church was established; long enough to launch well into life the leading spirits of the third generation, while there are still members of the first lingering here and there, and the majority of the second are in the prime of a vigorous manhood and womanhood.

From the fact that the fathers and mothers of the present dominant generation were drawn from the humble and poor among mankind, it is often inferred that Mormons are people of mean spirit. Elswhere I have considered this question, and can do no better than quote the passage here.*

"Called by the voice of the Spirit, 'two of a family and one of a city,' and led and driven to the barren wastes of the Rocky Mountains, they are today holding up the highest standard of righteousness that the world has ever seen. Judged superficially they may, indeed, seem what their traducers call them, the poor, the unlettered, the despised of the world, for, in the language of Paul, not many wise men, after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, have the moral courage to accept the real Gospel of Jesus. As in the days of Christ, they have been chosen from the ranks of the fishermen, the farmers, the artisians of the world; but humble as they are, they are raised to the rank of true manhood and womanhood by a virtue which you that read, scholar and fine gentleman that you are, perchance may not possess: the moral courage to forsake houses and lands, break the dearest ties of kindred face the obloquy of a surprised and outraged social circle, and cast in your lot with a people counted the filth and offscourings of all things,—for the sake of an ideal!

"Call them low-bred, if you will,—ignorant,

*Scientific Aspects of Mormonism, p. 112.

uncouth, mistaken zealots,—anything that will relieve your sense of propriety, your pitiful infatuation for sham and conventionality: but do not dare to call them cowards. For, animating those ungraceful figures bent with toil, guiding the caresses of those calloused hands, unfitted for palette or key-board; strangely light in those rugged countenances, when no apparent cause is visible,—are the souls of heroes and heroines; not, indeed, of the kind that do and dare for the plaudits of the world; but of the kind utterly unconscious that they are brave; fearing only the eye of their Maker, and seeking solace of Him in secret places, with tears and broken sobs, when all the world spurns them.

"Such are the foundation stones that Mormonism has dug from the mud and debris 'neath the feet of the gay and fashionable world. Such have been many of the Elders it has commissioned to carry its message back to their fellows in bondage. Little wonder that they avoided the great and the learned, and labored among the poor. But now their sons and daughters are here. These need fear no comparison, even by the world's standard. Tall and straight and comely, gifted with intellectual vigor and spiritual insight, they are among the flower of Shem, reserved for this last conflict with sham and artificiality. Nor do they lack the courage of their fathers and mothers. At this very moment two thousand such young men are traveling throughout the world at the sacrifice of their own hard-earned means; preaching the message of the new dispensation to all who will hear it; and finding ineffable joy, even when a stone and bed of leaves by the

way side serves them for rest, and the infinite starry canopy is the only roof above their heads. And at home in the valleys, as the shades of night deepen, hundreds of young mothers are calling flocks of rosy-cheeked children with neat but unpretentious homes; and there in the little parlor they will kneel together, and pray that papa may be protected against mobs and evil designing men.

"And there are fifty thousand other young men ready to go, when the call shall come; and as many young women ready to do their part in keeping up the table, rearing their children to fear and love the Lord,— if need be, to send their husbands money with which to buy shoes. Nor is this fanaticism; it results from a dynamic realization of that reciprocal and indisoluble ideal—love of God and love of man; it is only a sane and rational approach toward that altruism which shall in time be world-wide,—a clear sensing of the law that he who would lose his life shall save it, he who would save his life shal lose it. And though the results, measured in converts are meagre enough, yet measured in their reactions on the charcter of the Latter-day Saints as a people, they are above the price of rubies."

How, let me ask the scientific reader, will the moral courage that dared face the scorn of the world, and afterward was undeterred by the hardships of the American desert,— how, I repeat, may we expect these sterling qualities of character inherent and developed in the fathers and mothers of the earlier

generation, to affect the offspring of today and the future? Was it not an admirable school of adversity in which to lay the foundations of a virile people?

Consider next the fact that these sturdy men and women are drawn from everywhere in Europe and America, and that there is consequently such a mingling of blood from widely separated peoples as perhaps no other place in the world presents examples of. What effect for strengthening and invigorating the race must this intimate commingling of nationalities have on the physical basis of life? Let the student of anthropology come and see the transformation that a single generation has brought about and then let him estimate the power of this factor in fitting the Mormons of the future to survive.

But the factors that promise most for the future of this people are the ideals which cluster around the marriage covenant. There is first the idea that the union is not merely for time but also for eternity. That is to say, a marriage pronouncement by authority from God, if a divine dispensation for two souls to become, during the countless ages before them, one self-per-

petuating being; a being having the same power of begetting or creating life that God himself has. This union is not merely one of poetical sentiment; on the contrary it is precisely that which was contemplated by Paul when he said: "The man is not without the woman, nor the woman without the man, *in the Lord.*" It takes the two to make the One; a single being may be saved but he would be only half of a self-perpetuating being, and therefore infertile. God distinctly points out this dual character in himself when He declared that He made man ***and woman*** in His image.

Such a conception must inevitably tend to the stability of the marriage covenant. Not that divorces cannot be had in the Mormon Church; for Latter-day Saints realize that the ceremony is not the real binding power. The ceremony is to the final union merely what the wrapping is to the graft,—a means of holding in place the parts till it becomes evident or not that they will unite. If the union becomes organic as when the graft grows and becomes part of the tree, then it is a true marriage. Little need to say of such a union, "Let no man put it asunder:" for in this case, as in that of the growing

graft, the spiritual knitting together is that of divine law, and what God has thus joined no man *can* put asunder. Divorces are possible only where the union remains mechanical (as when the graft refuses to grow). Conventional bonds may hold two such beings together during mortal probation; but nothing save a spiritual intermingling of life with life can make the marriage eternal.

Of course every effort is made to prevent hasty action in ill-mated marriages, and to remove, if possible, the cause of friction, to the end that the parties may find the true basis of becoming one. In many, perhaps most, cases, marriages entered into on wrong lines, may thus be righted; but where the bond continues to be mechanical, showing so signs of becoming organic, and produces irritation rather than love and harmony, manifestly the principles of salvation are sub-served by a divorce. But separations of this kind are not very common, and will become fewer as the Latter-day Saints come into the full heritage of the Gospel; for then marriage will not take place from any other motive than the begetting of a righteous posterity; in other words,

the fulfilling of the first divine command, with all the blessings of domestic life incident thereto. And since the constancy of the marriage covenant is the strongest safeguard of the home, the Mormon ideal presents thus at the outset an unusually strong mark of enduring character.

We may next note that in the phrase, 'righteous posterity' lies another ideal associated with Mormon marriage. It is not enough merely to bring children into the world: they must never be suffered to forget the purpose of mortal life. "Inasmuch," says a revelation to Joseph Smith, "as parents have children in Zion, or in any of her Stakes which are organized, that teach them not to understand the doctrine of repentance, faith in Christ the Son of the living God, and of baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of the hands, when eight years old, the sin be upon the head of the parents, for this shall be a law unto the inhabitants of Zion or any of her Stakes which are organized; and their children shall be baptized for the remission of their sins, when eight years old and receive the laying on of the hands; and they shall also

teach their children to pray and to walk uprightly before the Lord "*

The virile part of instruction, however, is always example; to which end parents must live a life worthy of imitation. This involves, among other things the keeping of the 'Word of Wisdom,' a revelation to the Prophet Joseph enjoining abstinence from all narcotic and alcoholic stimulants; such as tea, coffee, tobacco, beer, wine and whiskey; also from meats save in times of cold weather or famine. Let us not forget, in this connection that we are considering the question of whether the Mormon family is likely to survive, in the sense of being fitter to survive, that the ideal against which it is in competition now, were there no other factor in the social life of Mormonism than this same living according to the 'Word of Wisdom,' it alone would be conclusive. Preserve intact the integrity of the nervous system for a generation or two, and you cannot fail to have a race vitally superior to one which has been undermined generation after generation by neuratic poisons.

Another ideal associated with the rearing of children is one already referred to; viz,

*Doctrine and Covenants, p. 251.

the obligation to ceaseless industry. "Let every man be diligent in all things," says the Lord in a revelation to Joseph Smith. "And the idler shall have no place in the Church, except he repent and mend his ways."* Here is another passage: "Thou shalt not be idle; for he that is idle shall not eat the bread nor wear the garments of the laborer." †So also in another revelation: "And the inhabitants of Zion also shall remember their labors . . .in all faithfulness; for the idler shall be had in remembrance before the Lord."** as before suggested these injunctions may be regarded as merely re-emphasizing the work-side of the fourth commandment, which had been lost sight of as a moral duty.

Be this as it may, the point to be considered here is the contribution which honest toil, when joined with temperance and frugality, makes toward the building up of a virile race. Did space permit, it would not be difficult to show that the greatest blessing given to mankind,—and one, morover without which salvation in Heaven or even

*Doctrine and Covenants, p. 264.
†Ibid, p. 173.
**Ibid, 251.

civilization on earth, would be impossible,—is this same necessity of daily labor, so long decried by orthodox theology as the curse of Adam. It is a blessing even to him who accepts it with the spirit of a slave, especially when compared with the demoralizing effects of idleness; but it is a greater blessing to him who meets it with a glad heart, and recognizes in it, not only the means of winning a livelihood on earth, but the only means of carving out the life eternal.

A fundamental tenet of Mormonism is that 'no man can be saved in ignorance.' Joseph Smith declared that 'a man is saved no faster than be gains intelligence;' also that 'the glory of God is intelligence.' It is only as man becomes like God that he is saved. There is only one way to become like Him: that is by progressively attaining intelligence. It follows that no man can rear a family acording to the Mormon ideal without giving his children every advantage within his power toward securing an education. The needs of social service,—the work to be done in the world,—would alone suffice to stimulate this aspect of Mormon social evolution; when those needs however are re-enforced by the Mormon's very hope

of eternal life, will there be any station in the world of thought and enlightened progress that he will not ultimately fill?

I have thus outlined in brief some of the ideals clustering around the marriage covenant; and the consequent power which such ideals give toward race stability. There is (1) a recognition of the eternal nature of that covenant and hence the power such an ideal gives to combat the present social tendency toward divorce; (2) there is the recognition of the object of marriage as that of begetting offspring, with an enlightened understanding of the reasons therefore both immediate and ultimate, and hence the power to combat the present social tendency to race suicide; (3) there is the recognition of the duty to rear children in the fear of the Lord, and therefore the power of prepetuating "Mormonism:" (4) there is the avoidance of narcotics and all other nerve poisons, and consequently the power to keep up the highest of physical and mental vitality; (5) there is the recognition of thrift and industry as a moral duty, not only for the sake of a living on earth, but as the only means of attaining eternal life, and hence the power which work compels of living

ever in touch with the wholsome influences of the natural world; (6) there is finally the recognition of intelligence not only as the master key to all social service on earth, but as the very nature and essence of salvation and exaltation in a world to come, and hence the probability that Mormons will ultimately be at the very forefront of all enlightened movements for the replenishing and subduing' of this planet.

Consider next what environment is contributing to Mormon fitness to survive? the Rocky Mountains, inaccessible save as conquered by the pick and drill; the desert, silent and sullen save as man compels the disclosure of its hidden stores of wealth; the clear sky, the untainted atmosphere, the boundless freedom of open areas, the brooding of overshadowing peaks and ranges,—all these factors are silently imparting a largeness of ideals, a strength and ruggedness of character, and a dominancy of manhood which cannot fail to make themselves felt more and more in the affairs of mankind.

Another environment equally potent for the future of the race is to be found in the very nature of the Mormon family it-

self. Where many children live together, the democratic virtues, as well as those more refined qualities summed up in the word altruism, cannot fail to thrive. Industry, self-reliance, mutual forbearance, the give-and-take spirit, fraternal sympathy—all the qualities so essential to a republic have their birth-place in such a family. Nor is it easy to see how they could be born, let alone thrive, in the selfish atmosphere of the present so-called American ideal. Will any sociologist advocate the thought that this nation could have come into existence, had it been necessary to recruit the Continental army from the superaesthetic pairs or trios of the present fashionable family? Could even the notion of freedom have been engendered from such social narrowness? Fancy Benjamin Franklin the beribboned Fauntleroy of an American palace, instead of the thirteenth child of a family of fifteen!

There still is another factor, which, though it comes rather within the purview of faith than of scientific research, is none the less to be reckoned with in estimating the momentum of Mormonism upon future ages. As before suggested, it is incredible to Latter-day Saints that mere change of

ideal should alone be responsible for their marvelous fertility; their faith is direct and simple enough to believe that the God who made Sarah's womb fruitful, and heard the prayers of Hannah and Elizabeth, is likewise blessing them with the care of glorious spirits which the world at large are rejecting. In short they believe that being born is no more an accidental occurrence,than going to a new country. We all lived in heaven during a pre-existence antedating earth-life perhaps by millions of years; we are called to be born on earth by a law as inevitable as the law which takes us from the earth again. Consequently spirits go, on the earth-plane, where God distributes them; and herein lies the chief reason why Mormons believe in the transcendent mission their posperity is to play in the affairs of the world; not only transcendent as to numbers, but also as to leadership. In short they believe that through this same despised and universally contemned lineage will be ushered in eventually, the Millennium, or Christ's reign on earth.

VI.

PROBLEMS TO BE SOLVED—CONCLUSION.

Before the conclusion reached at the close of the last chapter can be realized,Latter-day Saints must master certain problems which are even now conforting them; problems of a distinctly disintegrating character.

The first I shall mention is a growing tendency among would-be fashionable families in our midst to be ashamed of and want to apologize for their large families. In other cases they have taken care that there should be no occasion for such apology. Both types are often among the most highly respected people of our towns and villages. I call to mind now one professor in our Church schools to whose fireside only the fashionable two have yet been permitted to come. In my opening chapter I suggested that such people, though *in* the Church, were not really *of* it. They may have been of it at one time, but sentimentality of this type is foreign to the sturdiness of Mormonism; it is in fact, comparable only to the yellowness

which occasionally strikes some limb of an otherwise healthy tree; whereby we know that nature is beginning the process of sloughing that branch.

Various plausible excuses are put forward, if this attitude be questioned; as, "My wife's health will not permit her to raise a family" (which would be legitamate enough if it were true. She is often well enough, however, for euchre parties three or four nights a week). Or, "We desire to get a home-nest before we get birdies," which is generally a very transparent subterfuge. I happen to know (from personal experience) that a child may be well-born even in a dug-out. Or, "We do not believe in large families: we believe it is better to raise one or two children in culture and refinement, than half a dozen in poverty. The world would be better off if—etc." This latter argument leads directly to the justification urged by Malthus.

Let no man deceive himself: these arguments, however cunningly they may be dressed up, are no part of the spirit and genius of Mormonism. Tear off the mask and one sees at a glance their real hue and bias. They are the old justifications put

forward by the ideal which now all but completely foredooms Babylon; and they spring from precisely the same old root of desire for personal ease and comfort; disguised perhaps as culture, love of refinement, fashion, and ostentation. Given selfishness, which lurks in every human heart, and a good bank account and presently we shall have—no matter where, whether in Mormon or in heathen land,—a marriage between them which shall give birth to pomp and show, sham and artificiality, everything but children. Such people will have carriages and fine horses, or perhaps automobiles; they will even have poodles and lapdogs, but they draw the line at their own offspring. And on the whole, this is well; for should such selfishness pile up generation after generation, it would at last become monumental.

The treatment of this defection among Latter-day Saints must for the most part be constitutional. Establish again between them and God the communion which we speak of as an abiding testimony of the Gospel, and the Malthusian ideal of family life will soon give way to the Bible ideal. Often, however, the remedy needs to be local as

well; young married people must be taught the folly of putting off till a later period in life the begetting of children while they enjoy the pleasures of society and amass wealth and physical comforts. A day comes at last when they will reap a harvest of remorse. Even in the fashionable circles of the world,—such is the testimony of physicians, women, who, while young and attractive were willing to go through fire and water to avoid maternity, would, when it becomes too late, go through hell-fire itself, if thereby they might retrieve the consequences of their folly. Among Latter-day Saints the remorse is more terrible by how much the sinners realize more truly what they have *lost*.

The next problem is that which results directly from our having given up plural marriage. How, under present social circumstances, shall we make good the ideal that *every* woman worthy of maternity, has natural inalienable right to a husband and children; as truly so as that every worthy man has a natural inalienable right to a wife and children?

Nature seems to provide for this social equality of the sexes, by keeping even, or

nearly even, the male and female population. What subtle poison is it, then, that she distils into the veins of the male sex, to make the number of men fit for married life comparatively smaller than the number of women? Everywhere in the world does this seem to be the case. The disproportion seems not to be so great among Latter-day Saints, though just what it is cannot be told in percentages. From the very difficulty of drawing the line of fitness, this disparity must ever remain a general quality; and yet there it is, recognizable in all our wards, by any one who will give attention to a general comparison of the sexes.

Manifestly the working out of this problem lies in the direction of making every boy worthy as a husband of his birth-mate girl; not only worthy of her, but willing to assume the responsibility of honorable wedlock. Seriously, let me ask, have we as Latter-day Saints done all that we might have done in this direction?

The answer must be an unequivocal no. We have not even waked up to a realization of where the defection in character comes in. I spoke just now of nature distilling the weakness into the veins of the male. This

seems, however, very improbable. Of twins, begotten by the same impulse, and subject to the same parental influences, is it rational to believe that the boy inherits tendencies which shall make him unworthy the responsibilities of wedlock, and that the girl does not? The trouble will be found, I think, in the fact that we have a double moral standard for the bringing up of children. We may think that this is not the case, so naturally and unconsciously does the race transmit the distinctions between what boys may do, and what girls may do. To bring out the fact of this double standard of training, which, be it remembered, begins with infancy and does not end till parents lose all control, just suppose your girls attempting to do what you excuse in your boys; or suppose your boys restricted in deportment and conduct by the moral code which it seems so natural to impose upon girls. Is not the fact plain?

In this inequality of training lies, I believe, the cause of much of the disparity in the outcome of connubial worthiness. Interesting as is this question, space will not permit me to enter into it. Indeed, a theme even as long as this one, would hardly do

it justice. However, it is surely worthy of our most careful investigation. On the face of it, there seems no radical reason why *all* our young men should not be fitted, individual for individual, to mate with our young women, and when this reform shall have been brought about, the problem of not abridging woman's right to marry and beget children, any more than man's, is now abridged, will have been largely solved without the intervention of plural marriage.

A third problem which thereatens the disintegration of Mormonism is the unmitigated curse of accumulating, and especially of bequeathing much wealth. Most truly did the poet say,—more truly than he could possibly have known—

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

The mere accumulation, brings, as we have seen in nine cases out of ten, the curse of diverting a man from the true, eternal purposes of life and makes him follow a trivial earthly substitute,—a blind but gaudily lighted trail, which must inevitably end in an abyss. But the accumulation, can-

not from the very nature of the reactions for good which are bound up in the word accumulate bring to the posessor a tithe of the damnation which the bequeathing of wealth brings to the recipient.

Think what opportunities for character developement such a father robs his son of! To be born in a palace is a calamity which nothing in the rich man's life can compensate for. Instead of the winter morning tingling his ears and toes as he moves about doing his chores, chopping wood, carrying water, milking cows, feeding horses, shucking corn, instead of the hot summer day filled with toil, and sweat, and gnats in his hair, and a thousand anxieties about a thousand duties; instead of the natural earth and sky, and sun, moon, and stars, and all the wealth of the universe that God spreads out to mould and fashion us, through pain and pleasure, hunger, thirst, and however else the infinite can get in its whack at our sluggish finite—instead of all this *life* open to the poor boy, behold him, the princeling, yawning upon immaculate pillows an hour after sunrise, and reaching sleepily out to touch a button! How must the angels weep to behold such a spectable of effeminacy!

How can such a child ever be born of God? How can his soul he stirred to the harmonies of the universe? How can he ever be saved? It has become fashionable to spiritualize Christ's parable of the rich man,

the camel, and the eye of a needle; making the latter merely a small gate, where the camel's load had to be taken off. But the problem of a rich man's entering the Kingdom of God appeals to me. I rather believe in the old interpertation, in which the needle was a needle; for the curse upon the accumulator of riches is that they take man away from the God he found in days of poverty; the curse they bring to him who inherits them is that he developes no desire to find God, nor even things Godly.

Thank Heaven for the social conditions which have scattered the wealth of Zion evenly, so that none are very poor, none very rich, and all must labor for their daily bread. The problem on which the perpetuity of the Mormon family ideal depends, is to keep up this industrial equality. Let no Latter-day Saint shape his business so as to leave wealth to his children. If there is danger of it, let him beget more children and see to it that when they have been equipped for life by all the power that home training and a liberal education can give,—equipped with flawless bodies and virile minds,—there shall be no patrimony left to quarrel about. Thus shall he set their faces and nerve their hearts for the struggle with life; the glorious struggle which has salvation and exaltation bound up with it, and which is no more felt by the inheritor of wealth than if he were a golden chrysalis

sleeping the ages through in an ebony cocoon. If these children in turn shall win undue wealth, let them use it so as to leave their offspring poor; never forgetting that the greatest blessing any mortal can be born to here below is life untrammeled by artificial accumulations.

But all the problems of the Latter-day Saints are summed up in the one problem: how to awaken the spiritual life in their children, and how to keep the divine torch ablaze. To make them members of the Church is very easy—by baptizing them when they are eight years of age. They are thus in the kingdom, but not of it. Nor will they ever be of it by anything that anyone else can do for them; each must be born of God on his own account, before his life can vitally mingle with the life of the Church. When, however, he is so made one with Christ, he will perpetuate the Mormon ideal of family life as surely as the bud which grows will in due time blossom and bear fruit after its kind.

On this divine basis, and on this alone, will the Latter-day Saint be instrumental in fulfilling the promises made to Abramam: that his seed should become as numerous as the stars in Heaven or the sands upon the sea shore; and thereby should the nations of the earth be blessed.

ERRATA.

NOTE.—Being absent in the Eastern States when No. 4 was published, I was obliged to trust the proof-reading to another, with the results indicated below. Corrections are in bold-face type.

Page 315. **Kindness** for kindnes; **Oh** for **O**,
" 324. **persists** for presists; **homeward** for homward.
" 325. **across** for aoros; **yawns** for yearns.
" 328. **sly** for shy.
" 333. **I** for i.
" 341. **number** for nummer.
" 343. **succeed** for succeeded.
" 345. **conservatively** for conservative.
" 353. **have** for had; **knitting** for knotting.
" 354. **quantity** for quality.
" 367. **shalt** for shall; **stratum** for statum.
" 372. Read: descendants of New England **stock**.
" 380. Instead of 3rd line read: **dies within them. How pathetic is that**; also **their** for the before inevitable, and **Suppose** for Supposing.
" 386. Foot note should be at bottom of page.
" 390. strangely **lighting** for light in.
" 391. **into** neat for with neat; **indissoluble** for Indisoluble; **shall** for shal.
" 392. **is** for if, on 3rd line from bottom,
" 394. **no** signs for so signs.
" 396. **than** the ideal for that etc; **Were** for were; **Neurotic** for neuratic.
" 397. **As** before for as etc; **has** been lost for had etc: **moreover** for morover.
" 398. **according** for acording.
" 399. **therefor** for therefore; **perpetuating** for prepetuating.
" 402. **posterity** for posperity.
" 404. **legitimate** for legitamate.
" 406. Read: **a** natural inalienable right.
" 407. **quantity** for quality.
" 408. **prenatal** for parental.
" 409. **inevitably** for Inevitably.
" 410. **spectacle** for spectable.
" 411. Read: appeals to me **as next to impossible.**
" 412. **Abraham** for Abramam.

☞ *To be pasted at the end of No. 4, Mormon Point of View.*

For a complete catalogue send to:
CATALOGUE A. P.O. Box 612, West Jordan, Utah, 84084

RICKS COLLEGE
DAVID O. MCKAY LRC
REXBURG, IDAHO 83440

RICKS COLLEGE
DAVID O. McKAY LRC
REXBURG, IDAHO 83440

BX
8605 1 M82
The Mormon point-of-view
Nelson Nels L (Nels Lars)
1862-1946

31 04 001 182347